HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 3, 1993*

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We know, O gracious God, that there is much in the lives of people that is difficult and painful, but we also know that there is joy and celebration too. We experience that which is sorrowful and frustrating, but we sense also the presence of dignity and majesty and honor among people and what they do. We pray, O loving God, that we will walk the paths of our lives with the assurance that Your presence is ever with us, that Your power can sustain us, and that Your peace is with us to the end of our days. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I respectfully demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 150, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—246

Abercrombie	Bonior	Combest	Dooley	Kopetski	Price (NC)	Greenwood	Manzullo	Schaefer
Ackerman	Borski	Condit	Durbin	Kreidler	Rahall	Hancock	McCandless	Schiff
Andrews (ME)	Boucher	Conyers	Edwards (CA)	LaFalce	Rangel	Hastert	McCollum	Schroeder
Andrews (NJ)	Brewster	Cooper	Edwards (TX)	Lambert	Ravenel	Hefley	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Andrews (TX)	Brooks	Coppersmith	Engel	Lancaster	Reed	Herger	McHugh	Shaw
Applegate	Browder	Costello	English (AZ)	Lantos	Reynolds	Hobson	McKeon	Shays
Archer	Brown (FL)	Coyne	English (OK)	LaRocco	Richardson	Hoekstra	McMillan	Shuster
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (OH)	Cramer	Eshoo	Laughlin	Rose	Hoke	Meyers	Skeen
Baesler	Bryant	Danner	Fazio	Lehman	Roth	Horn	Mica	Smith (MI)
Barcia	Cantwell	Darden	Fields (LA)	Levin	Rowland	Huffington	Michel	Smith (OR)
Barlow	Cardin	de la Garza	Filner	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard	Hunter	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Carr	Deal	Fingerhut	Lipinski	Rush	Inhofe	Molinari	Snowe
Bateman	Chapman	DeFazio	Fish	Long	Sabo	Istook	Moorhead	Solomon
Becerra	Clement	DeLauro	Flake	Lowey	Sanders	Jacobs	Morella	Spence
Beilenson	Clinger	Derrick	Foglietta	Maloney	Sangmeister	Johnson (CT)	Murphy	Stearns
Bevill	Clyburn	Deutsch	Foley	Mann	Santorum	Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Stump
Bilbray	Coleman	Dicks	Frank (MA)	Manton	Sarpalius	Kasich	Oxley	Sundquist
Bishop	Collins (IL)	Dingell	Frost	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Sawyer	Kim	Packard	Talent
Blackwell	Collins (MI)	Dixon	Furse	Markey	Schumer	King	Paxon	Taylor (MS)
			Gallo	Matsui	Scott	Kingston	Petri	Taylor (NC)
			Gejdenson	Mazzoli	Serrano	Klug	Porter	Thomas (CA)
			Gephardt	McCloskey	Sharp	Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Thomas (WY)
			Geren	McCurdy	Shepherd	Kyl	Quillen	Torkildsen
			Gibbons	McDermott	Skaggs	Lazio	Quinn	Upton
			Gillmor	McHale	Skelton	Leach	Ramstad	Vucanovich
			Gilman	McInnis	Slattery	Levy	Regula	Walker
			Glickman	McKinney	Slaughter	Lewis (CA)	Ridge	Walsh
			Gonzalez	McNulty	Smith (IA)	Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Weldon
			Gordon	Meehan	Smith (NJ)	Lightfoot	Rogers	Wolf
			Green	Meek	Spratt	Linder	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
			Gunderson	Menendez	Stark	Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Zeliff
			Gutierrez	Mfume	Stenholm	Machtley	Royce	Zimmer
			Hall (OH)	Mineta	Stokes			
			Hall (TX)	Minge	Strickland			
			Hamilton	Mink	Studds			
			Hansen	Moakley	Stupak			
			Harman	Mollohan	Swett			
			Hastings	Montgomery	Swift			
			Hayes	Moran	Synar			
			Hefner	Murtha	Tanner			
			Hilliard	Myers	Tauzin			
			Hinchey	Nadler	Tejeda			
			Hoagland	Natcher	Thornton			
			Hochbrueckner	Neal (MA)	Torres			
			Holden	Neal (NC)	Torricelli			
			Houghton	Oberstar	Towns			
			Hoyer	Obey	Traficant			
			Hughes	Olver	Tucker			
			Hutchinson	Ortiz	Unsoeld			
			Hutto	Orton	Velazquez			
			Inglis	Owens	Vento			
			Inslee	Pallone	Visclosky			
			Johnson (GA)	Parker	Volkmer			
			Johnson (SD)	Pastor	Waters			
			Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)	Watt			
			Johnston	Pelosi	Waxman			
			Kanjorski	Penny	Wheat			
			Kaptur	Peterson (FL)	Wilson			
			Kennedy	Peterson (MN)	Wise			
			Kennelly	Pickett	Woolsey			
			Kildee	Pickle	Wyden			
			Kleczka	Pombo	Yates			
			Klein	Poshard				
			Klink					

NAYS—150

Allard	Burton	Duncan
Armey	Buyer	Dunn
Bachus (AL)	Callahan	Emerson
Baker (CA)	Calvert	Everett
Baker (LA)	Camp	Ewing
Ballenger	Canady	Fawell
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Fowler
Bartlett	Clay	Franks (CT)
Barton	Coble	Franks (NJ)
Bentley	Collins (GA)	Gallegly
Bereuter	Crane	Gekas
Bilirakis	Crapo	Gilchrest
Bliley	Cunningham	Gingrich
Blute	Diaz-Balart	Goodlatte
Boehlert	Dickey	Goodling
Boehner	Doolittle	Goss
Bonilla	Dornan	Grams
Bunning	Dreier	Grandy

NOT VOTING—35

Berman	Henry	Roukema
Brown (CA)	Hyde	Saxton
Byrne	Jefferson	Schenk
Clayton	Knollenberg	Sisisky
Cox	Lloyd	Thurman
DeLay	Martinez	Valentine
Dellums	McDade	Washington
Evans	Miller (CA)	Whitten
Fields (TX)	Payne (VA)	Williams
Ford (MI)	Pomeroy	Wynn
Ford (TN)	Roemer	Young (AK)
Hamburg	Rostenkowski	

☐ 1225

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. MCCLOSKEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to recognize the heroic sacrifice of the Special

Agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in Waco, TX.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-392, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican leader, announces his appointment of Mr. STEVENS, to the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Capitol.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4355(a), of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. REID, from the Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Armed Services, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 6968(a), of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Ms. MIKULSKI, from the Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. SARBANES, at large, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1295(b), of title 46, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, ex officio, and Mr. BREAUX, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-392, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican leader, appoints Mr. STEVENS, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. NICKLES, as members of the Bipartisan Task Force on Senate Coverage.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 194(a), of title 14, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-392, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, appoints Mr. FORD, Mr. REID, and Mr. AKAKA, as members of the Bipartisan Task Force on Senate Coverage.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 9355(a), of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. EXON, from the Committee on Armed Services, and Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 86-380, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. DORGAN, to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, vice Mr. ROBB.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93-618, as amended by Public Law 100-418, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, appoints the following members of the Finance Committee as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations and as official advisers to the U.S. delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiation sessions relating to trade agreements: Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. DOLE; and as alternate official advisers: Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. WALLOP.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 3) 32

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democrat caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 110) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 110

Resolved, That the following named Members, be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives: Committee on the Budget: Glen Browder of Alabama; Lynn C. Woolsey of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNITION OF BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS AGENTS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 28, four agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms [ATF] gave their lives to uphold the rule of law in America. Fifteen other ATF agents were wounded by gunfire or hurt as they attempted to recover firearms and explosive devices held illegally at a ranch near Waco, TX.

In ATF's long history, extending back to the 1860's, 184 agents have given their lives in the line of duty. This honor roll now includes the four agents killed in Texas on February 28: Special Agent Steve Willis of the Bureau's Houston post of duty, Special Agent Robert J. Williams of Little Rock, and Special Agents Conway LeBleu and Todd McKeehan of New Orleans.

The deceased agents were members of ATF's elite special operations teams. These are the teams that take on the most hazardous jobs of apprehending armed, dangerous criminals. Last year ATF special operations teams went into action more than 230 times, without loss of life, in the process of bringing to justice many vicious criminals. Last year, also, investigations by ATF's small force of 2,200 agents caused charges to be brought against more than 13,000 bombers, arsonists, gun runners, dope dealers, and other dangerous offenders.

We aspire to build a peaceful democratic Nation. But so long as some people choose violence over law and order, our Nation shall require the services of peace officers, including those of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. I join with other citizens in commending the courage of the valiant ATF special agents, and their fellow peace officers throughout America, who face death and injury every day to keep our Nation safe. We grieve for the agents who died in the line of duty. We hurt with the agents injured in doing their duty. We extend our heartfelt sympathy and our total support to their families.

CHANGE

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members on this side of the aisle also add our condolences to the gentleman from Maryland's for the fallen agents, and we thank him for his statement.

Now let us turn to another subject that is on everyone's mind. I want to talk about change, Mr. Speaker.

Early this year, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States realized he had a problem, and his problem was how do Democrats, who are known by the American people to tax and spend, do the same thing to the American people and have them think that it has changed?

□ 1230

Mr. Stephanopoulos proved his worth because he came up with "contribute and invest" instead of "tax and spend."

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has achieved change.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Let the Chair state that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT] for 1 minute. There is a special list here, and the Chair states for the benefit of Democratic Members that the Chair will go by this list after this 1 minute by the gentleman from New Hampshire. Other Members who are not on the list will be recognized after the Chair has recognized all Members who are on the list.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(Mr. SWETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an issue which reaches to the heart of our efforts to regain the trust of the American people. I rise on behalf of bipartisan legislation—H.R. 349, the Congressional Accountability Act—which Congressman SHAYS and I have introduced to end the exemptions Congress enjoys from important laws which cover the private sector and executive branch.

These exemptions are the delight of Congress-bashers everywhere, exploited to put this body in the worst possible light. Those who wish to tear down this institution will continue to seize on these exemptions as ammunition—until we end them.

Beyond our institutional image, there is the simple issue of fairness. Whatever the rationale, it is wrong for us to pass laws which would otherwise apply to Congress and then exempt ourselves—in whole or in part—from their operation.

As an architect by training and a former alternative energy developer, I have worked under a wide gamut of Federal regulations. That experience leads me to believe that we will pass better laws if we know we will be living and working under them ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members who have not yet done so will add their names to the cosponsor list for H.R. 349.

STATEMENT OF THRIFTY 50

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has asked Americans to reinvent Government. He has also asked Congress to be specific regarding suggestions to cut the budget. I submit you cannot do one without the other.

Too many Federal dollars are still going to fund programs from yesterday's priority list. Clearly, when you are $4 trillion in debt, there are limits to affordability, and Congress needs to reassess the way it does its business and its list of what programs should and shouldn't be funded.

That's why I have introduced House Resolution 105, a list of 50 specific spending cuts totaling $190 billion over 5 years that I believe the Nation can do without. This resolution directs the Budget Committee to include these specific cuts in its budget resolution, or be able to justify on a program-by-program basis why further expenditures are necessary.

I encourage my colleagues to examine my list, or make one of their own. After all, managing the budget is our job. The people we work for are demanding responsible action today.

A DEFICIT REDUCTION GUARANTY TRUST FUND PROPOSAL

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the many concerns being expressed by my constituents is that the spending cuts and tax increases in the President's economic plan will not actually reduce the deficit.

Concern—and in some cases—outright cynicism about Congress' ability to stick to reducing the deficit is widespread among American voters.

These of course are the same voters who have signaled that they want leadership, that they are willing to sacrifice, that they are convinced that the President's plan will not be sabotaged by more spending.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that a number of us—including BILL BREWSTER will soon be circulating a letter outlining our deficit reduction guaranty trust fund proposal.

The essence of the plan is simple:

First, all net tax increases, savings in Social Security, entitlement cuts and debt service go into the trust fund and can only be used for deficit reduction.

Second, any increases in defense or domestic discretionary spending must be offset by cuts of an equal dollar amount in other spending programs.

Third, our plan has an airtight enforcement mechanism that prevents tax increases from being used for more spending.

This plan will work: It will cut the deficit, it will enforce budget discipline with no excuses and no gimmicks, and it will ensure the integrity of the Clinton plan.

Let me say to my colleagues that the American people are looking to us to join President Clinton in showing leadership on reducing our national deficit. The time is now.

MEMBERS URGED TO RESIST EFFORTS TO SAVE SELECT COMMITTEES

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that several weeks ago, the House voted 180 to 237 to eliminate the Select Committee on Narcotics. We eliminated one of the select committees, and the other three resolutions to reauthorize the other three select committees were suddenly withdrawn from the floor. Why? Because it looked like they were going to be defeated.

We all know what is going on and what has happened over these last several weeks, with all the arm-twisting that has been underway trying to find enough votes to save these four select committees that spend $4 million and employ 91 staffers when the work they are doing is being done by a number of other committees.

This morning what do I get in the mail? I get a "Dear Colleague" from our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], with all these great ideas about why we ought to save the Select Committee on Narcotics. Let me remind our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] and all my colleagues that the Select Committee on Narcotics is dead. It is gone, it has been eliminated, it is over.

I want to ask all my colleagues to dig up that "Dear Colleague" in their offices and look at it. On page 2 they will see a "clip and mail," whether they support, whether they are undecided, or whether they will not support the Select Committee on Narcotics. I would urge Members to clip that, mark it, and mail it.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need any of these select committees.

A MESSAGE TO THE "AGINNERS": GIVE THE PRESIDENT A CHANCE

(Mr. BROWDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing from the "aginners" about the President's economic plan and his plans for cutting the deficit. You know what an "aginner" is; that is somebody that no matter what you tell them, they are "agin it."

I understand the "aginners" because they have had 12 years of the administration using one set of books for the economic and budget figures and the Congress using another set. I would be "agin" an economic plan put together like that, too, just like I have been "agin" some of those budgets in the past.

The "aginners" have been told that cutting waste and fraud by itself will balance the budget. It is a good start, but it is only a start. Scapegoating waste and fraud in Government lets the White House, Congress, and everybody else avoid the hard choices.

The President has agreed to one set of figures—from the Congressional Budget Office—even if those CBO figures disagree with his figures. Let us give this novel idea of real numbers budgeting a chance.

Now he is telling us what his plans are for cutting the waste and fraud. The "aginners" need to listen. Honest talk about waste and fraud in Government, and real numbers. I do not know that it has been tried before. Let us give it a chance.

READ THE FINE PRINT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I urge the American people to read the fine print before they buy into President Clinton's economic package.

It's in those details that the reality emerges: This legislation is the same tired tax and spend policies with a fresh new sales approach.

President Clinton, on his traveling medicine show, has offered the American people a tonic that just won't work. He says that the tonic will cure all that ails the American economy.

But if you read exactly what this tonic contains, you know that this is a prescription for economic disaster.

Higher taxes means slower economic growth. More spending means a higher deficit. Smoke and mirrors spending cuts means no more progress on our national debt.

President Clinton is a persuasive and charismatic salesman who has a package that he wants the American people to buy. But I urge the American people to read the fine print first.

THE PUBLIC GOOD SUFFERS FROM FOLLOWING NARROW POLITICAL INTERESTS

(Mr. STRICKLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has challenged us to place the welfare of the country above narrow political interests.

The response of some in the minority party has been disappointing. One member—speaking of the majority—has said, "As long as we're kicking them in the shins and giving them a black eye, we're in control."

Mr. Speaker, such rhetoric is irresponsible.

In the chapel at Asbury College is a plaque. It says: "Here we enter a fellowship. Sometimes we will agree to differ. Always we should resolve to love and unite to serve."

In this Chamber we are bound to differ—that is how it ought to be.

But for some, there is no willingness to unite in order to serve. While President Clinton calls on patriotic Americans to come together and heal old wounds, the vanguard of the status quo in this body chooses to kick shins and give black eyes.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly love our country and want to promote the public good, we cannot condone mean-spirited hostility on this floor any longer. If we are going to address this Nation's problems, we need to act as mature adults, not like schoolchildren on a playground.

□ 1240

CLINTON TALKS STRAIGHT?

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently, Bill Clinton told the Nation that he was going to talk straight with Americans. Not even Jay Leno could come up with a better joke than that. He said he needed to raise taxes to tackle the deficit.

But don't worry; 70 percent of the burden will be paid by those earning $100,000 or more, so you're safe, right?

Wrong; his definition of $100,000 might surprise you.

It is not your actual income he is talking about—instead, he is talking about family economic income.

What is that? Well, it includes: Wages, IRA deductions, Keogh plans and life insurance, employer-provided benefits, imputed rent for homeowners, and anything else that could conceivably be of economic value to you.

So if you're thinking, I'm alright, I earn much less than $100,000. Check your numbers.

With Bill Clinton's so-called straight talk, $100,000 is less than you think.

THE COST OF BEING COMFORTABLE WHILE OTHERS ARE UNCOMFORTABLE

(Mr. BLACKWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues become uncomfortable with talk of taxing the rich.

That is because they are comfortable.

For them, it is better for the poor and middle class to be uncomfortable. They prefer to talk about spending cuts.

Those who are promoting spending cuts are not concerned that 35 million citizens, 14 percent of the entire population, have no health care coverage, and the numbers are rapidly rising.

They are not concerned that there are 9 million people out of work, including many who have given themselves in defense of this Nation.

They are comfortable. They have health care. They have jobs. They are comfortable, and they apparently prefer that the hungry, homeless, jobless, and those who lack health care are uncomfortable

Mr. Speaker, to those who ask the question, Can we afford a stimulus program, or can we afford health care reform?

I say, can we afford not to have a stimulus program, can we afford not to have health care reform?

If the questions are not properly asked, we can not get the right answers.

Those who are comfortable should consider the cost of clinging to their comfort, while so many are uncomfortable. We are one Nation.

TAKE MEAT CLEAVER TO SPENDING

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL] said that we are going to tax the rich more. The fact of the matter is that definition now includes anybody making about $24,000 or $25,000 a year, and President Clinton has said that we are going to have 1 dollar in spending cuts for every dollar in tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something: The Republican Study Committee has done a complete analysis of the Clinton proposal, and when you take out the smoke and mirrors, America, and take out the fee increases that they are counting as spending cuts, there is $100 in new spending for every $1 in spending cuts; $100 in new spending for ever $1 in spending cuts.

Before we load more taxes on the American people, we ought to take a meat cleaver to spending. Then talk about taxes.

CUT REPUBLICAN SACRED COWS FROM BUDGET

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I pray that the Congress of the United States will catch up with the wisdom of the American people and support the President's package

You want a meat cleaver? We can still make some adjustments in that package, and we could use a meat cleaver to get $100 billion more. It will not be easy, but it can be done. Let us cut the Republican sacred cows.

Let us cut CIA and the intelligence budget. We do not need $28 billion or more for the CIA anymore. Let us cut star wars. It is an insult to the intelligence of the American taxpayer to continue a single penny more for star wars. The President has not gone far enough.

Let us cut NATO. NATO generals are living off the fat of the American taxpayers. They have lived off them long enough. We do not need NATO.

We do not need overseas bases. Overseas bases will not disrupt the economies of any of our communities if they are eliminated. We do not need those overseas bases. Let us cut them.

Let us cut the obsolete weapons systems. Let us cut the space station, slow it down even more. It is the wrong design anyhow, so let us cut it some more.

Let us cut the superconducting super collider. Let us cut the strategic oil reserve, and the mohair giveaway program. Let us cut the rural electrification program some more. Let us cut the subsidies that are there for farmers who make $150,000 or more.

Mr. Speaker, let us make some more adjustments in this package. But I support the package.

SHOOT FIRST, ASK QUESTIONS LATER

(Mr. GRAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, since his joint session speech, the President and his Cabinet have engaged in an impressive public relations campaign to sell his plan to the American people. One of his major claims about the plan is that it is straight forward and uses honest numbers. This is simply not the case.

Ross Perot said on the CBS Morning News that Americans still don't have accurate numbers on the plan and noted that the Devil is in the details. Most details of Clinton's plan have yet to be released, including specific defense cuts, details on the energy tax and an honest break-down of taxes versus spending.

The Democratic leadership is asking Congress to vote on this vague package in 2 weeks. They seem to be saying vote now, see the details later. This rushed vote amounts to a shoot-first, ask-questions-later policy. I urge my colleagues to demand the facts before any vote on the package.

GETTING REAL ABOUT THE DEFICIT

(Mr. KREIDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been back to my district twice since President Clinton announced his economic plan. That plan is winning support in my district.

The people I represent are tired of gridlock, tired of the blame game, tired of finger pointing, tired of business as usual. They are ready for the truth, ready for leadership, and ready to take charge of this country's future.

They may not like everything in Bill Clinton's plan, but they know it is fair, they know it is honest, and they know it is responsible.

The people who sent me here are ready to face the facts, and ready to take the steps necessary to cut the deficit.

They expect to hear more from the critics than rhetoric, more than numbers games and cheap talk. If the critics have better ideas, let's hear them. Not gimmicks—specifics.

We have had enough deficit demagoguery in the past 12 years. Reaganomics didn't work. Trickle down didn't work. Voodoo didn't work.

Let's try something real.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I referred to the mail and phone calls I am receiving in regards to President Clinton's economic proposal. Today, I will read excerpts of a letter I opened this morning from a gentleman in Peachtree City, GA.

DEAR MR. COLLINS: I am 81 years old and I am on social security. I am opposed to Mr. Clinton's program. He is hitting us too hard. He says he is fair but is not.

I am strongly opposed to "value added tax." AARP is pushing this, but they fouled up before. Remember "catastrophic healthcare?"

Past history shows any increase in revenue will be wasted. Cut wasteful spending.

I think Clinton is wrong about homosexuals in the military.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman further wrote:

I trust him about as far as I can throw an anvil.

He closed by stating:

I hope you, fellow Republicans, and conservative Democrats can change Clinton's programs to something practical.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would remind the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] that the reference the gentleman made to the President is not in order.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to a letter that I received. I have a copy of the letter in my pocket. I do not refer the remarks to any one individual except you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Part of the letter should not be read into or inserted in the RECORD. The statements of other persons, if unparliamentary, should not be utilized in debate.

WORK TOGETHER TO MAKE PRESIDENT'S PLAN WORK

(Ms. LAMBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of President Clinton's plan, and also in support of his willingness and courage to do something.

President Clinton's economic plan is a great first step towards reining in our spiraling deficit. We all here agree we must cut wasteful spending while continuing to offer necessary services, as well as providing stimulus and incentives that will produce long-term economic health for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited that the President has given Congress a program for change and the opportunity to work with the administration to fine-tune the Nation's economic recovery.

□ 1250

I would like to remind my colleagues that this Nation was built on rural communities and that rural communities are dependent on agricultural economy. Our American farmers have endured more cuts than any other industry in recent years, and they are willing to do their fair share this go-around. But the success of our economic recovery will depend on the involvement of all areas in this Nation.

We must reinvest in rural America, what this country was built on. Farming continues to be a growth industry with an increased productivity curve. Instead of punishing the industry for its growth, let us help our farmers continue to build by offering trade incentives and open and fair markets.

President Clinton has spent a great deal of time and effort to present us with a broad plan. Let us now join and work together to make that happen.

SPECIFIC SPENDING CUTS

(Mr. ZELIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, the President laid down a challenge to us, saying "That if we want more spending cuts, then we should be specific."

The real question, Mr. Speaker, is will you let us be specific and allow us to propose spending cuts?

Will you let the people's House have an open rule for spending cuts so that each Member's proposals to cut bloated Government spending can specifically be proposed and debated?

We accept the President's challenge, Mr. Speaker.

Now it is up to you. Give us an open rule to propose our specific budget cuts, as the President asked. Let each proposed budget cut be debated and voted upon.

Let the people of America examine our votes and find out the truth about who wants to cut Government spending and who doesn't. Give us an open rule for budget cuts, Mr. Speaker.

The President can't have it both ways. He can't demand that the Members be specific in proposing budget cuts, while the congressional leaders of his party muzzle the duly elected representatives from proposing budget cuts on the floor of the House.

Fancy speeches to town meetings, on talk shows, and to school kids will not

cut one penny from the budget fat. Budget cuts must be made when the budget is being acted upon.

What are you afraid of, Mr. Speaker? Let's put democracy back in the House of Representatives.

THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

(Ms. McKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the policies of the last 12 years resulted in the increase of two critical deficits—a financial deficit and a human resources deficit. Financial deficit has increased from $47.7 billion in 1980 to $228 billion in 1993. This is an enormous burden on the economy. Interest on the national debt costs each of us $800 per year.

The President's economic plan will decrease the deficit without triggering a recession. It also shifts resources to programs that invest in our people, our human resources. And no family's tax rate will increase unless income exceeds $140,000. I received the following letter from Robert C. Smith of Lithonia, GA, which I believe reflects the dominant view of the folks in my district:

I * * * urge you to strongly support the President's approach for reducing the nation's budget deficit situation. I, as a taxpayer, understand that this problem will never be corrected without some sacrifice from all citizens and if this means a greater tax burden to secure my children's future then so be it.

Mr. Smith goes on to urge us to make the necessary cuts in the Federal budget.

I am committed to supporting cuts in spending and reductions in taxpayer support recommended in the President's plan. And, I believe the American people would like to see more ineffective programs and unnecessary subsidies eliminated.

I call on my colleagues to hold the line on the President's proposed spending reductions and to be open to additional cuts in Federal spending.

TASK FORCE ON REFORM

(Mr. NUSSLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of GM and IBM, it is quite an honor for me to be named today as the chairman of the Republican Task Force on Government Reform, appointed by the Republican leadership. We certainly have our work cut out for us, but I have no doubt that we can accomplish our goal.

During his inaugural address, President Clinton spoke of the need to sacrifice and now, as the President begins to sell his package around the country, we know what that sacrifice means. He means raise taxes. But we have had an opportunity to visit with our constituents and they tell us, "It is the spending, stupid." Government is too big and it spends too much.

We have plenty of fat right here in the Federal Government, ready and waiting to be cut, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

In the past we have had many similar task forces, but we are going to take it one step further. We are going to bring it to the chopping block once and for all where it belongs. We believe the Republicans need to identify the waste dividend.

My colleagues can help. Our constituents can help out there. Give us your ideas. Give us your suggestions. We can downsize and streamline this Government.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

(Mr. FINGERHUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, we have witnessed an extraordinary dialog between the President and the American people over the future of this country. It has been impressive on both scores. Listening to a President speak openly and forthrightly with the American people and listening to the American people speak back from their hearts and their souls.

Mr. Speaker, now the debate and the discussion shifts to a debate between Congress and the American people. And we must deliver.

In just a couple short weeks on this floor we will vote on a budget resolution that will, for the first time, contain specific and far-reaching cuts, those cuts that President Clinton has proposed and those that this body will add.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon us to make this debate clear and precise for the American people over the next few weeks.

Let us vote on the cuts that the President has proposed and let us also vote on the investments in the future that he has proposed. And anyone who wishes to add or subtract should put their ideas forward and we will do so as well.

It is now up to us to continue the debate.

HELIUM RESERVES

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, last year while I was doing campaign research, I came across the now infamous national helium reserves. It astonished me that a program which began in 1929 had received continued funding. Even though the project was outdated and had lost $225 million in the last 2 years alone; even though there is a thriving private sector market in helium; and, even though a projected savings in the first year would be $120 million and over 5 years $700 million would be saved.

A change in the national helium reserve will not threaten our national security. Currently, there are 35 billion cubic feet of helium in the Federal stockpile, enough to meet public sector needs for over 20 years.

The card I received from a constituent just this morning says it all, plain and simple, stop spending first.

It is time that we heed this advice and make the necessary cuts before we tax ourselves back into a recession.

LET US HEAR SOME SUGGESTIONS FROM THE OTHER SIDE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening patiently to all the criticisms of President Clinton's proposal from the other side. Let me quickly run through them.

One person said, when the President says invest he means spend. But he does not hold up a sign that shows that the public investment in this country has declined steadily, which is why we have such a sluggish economy.

One complains about contribution really means tax, but does not show the declining income of the middle class person who knows that there are going to have to be some significant steps taken.

One complains about moving too fast, but I presume then they want to move slowly. I do not know what it is.

One complains about tonic but does not talk about the snake oil that got sold to Americans for the last 12 years and has put the patient in the shape it is today.

The fact of the matter is, I have heard everything from the other side but what they want to do. I have heard complaints, but I want to hear a proposal. Do not tell me about cuts that you want to do. What are the cuts?

The fact is, they have got the B–1. They keep it in the hangar. They want to keep it a secret. And worst of all, they do not want it outside because they know the turkey will not fly.

My district says, get on with the job. The President has put forward a program. There are some improvements that can be made, but let us do the job and deal with the problems that the President has addressed.

SPENDING CUTS

(Mr. POMBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I come before my colleagues to, I guess, start off a process that we began last week. The President came before our body and asked for specific cuts. If we did not like what he proposed, to come out with specific cuts.

As my colleagues have heard from a few of the Members of the freshman class before me, and those who will follow me, we are giving specific cuts that we would like to see be made to the Federal budget. Each Member is prepared and willing to back up their cuts that they are proposing.

□ 1300

We ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members on the other side of the aisle, to take a look at the cuts that we are proposing and pick 20 of them that the Members like, pick 10 of them that they like, pick one that they like, but please, let us cut our Federal budget. Let us reduce spending before we even think about taxes.

GENERAL MOTORS DESERVES AN APOLOGY

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Michael Gartner, the boss of NBC News, was fired. Mr. Gartner was fired because of the safety test he ordered on General Motors trucks.

Let us look at the facts. First, Mr. Gartner made sure that the gas tanks were tampered with. Then Mr. Gartner ordered that tiny, little model rocket engines were attached to the trunk so that, on impact, the truck would blow up. Bingo, it did.

If that is enough to muffle our slip clutch here, folks, Mr. Gartner is crying foul. I say that the only justice in all of this is that Mr. Gartner got fired. Sayonara, see you later. General Motors deserves an apology because of the deceit and the lies.

I think it is time that we accentuate the fact that the media should report the news, not make the news.

DETAILS, NOT GIMMICKS

(Mr. McKEON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has been talking a good game about his economic package, but he continues to avoid what the American people are most interested in, the details. We know about the sacrifice and suffering that the President is calling for, but, as Ross Perot says, "The devil is in the details."

You may recall that during the campaign, Mr. Perot lamented that we may soon be a nation of chicken pluckers. Under the President's plan, not even the chicken pluckers will be safe, since they will be paying for inspections by the USDA which President Clinton calls a spending cut. I would call that a gimmick. Increasing the taxes on social security recipients is also called a spending cut. I would call that a gimmick, too.

We deserve an accurate, detailed version of President Clinton's economic plan, without the gimmicks. Our constituents deserve to know what sacrifices their President expects of them. If the President claims that he will demand sacrifice, we deserve to know, before we vote on his proposal, whether he expects sacrifice from just the American people, or whether he will expect sacrifice from Government, too.

Please, President Clinton, give us details—not gimmicks.

IT'S PUT UP OR SHUT UP TIME FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, in an op-ed piece, has said that it is put up or shut up time for campaign finance reform. I could not agree more with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Indeed, if we do not take advantage of this opportunity we may not be able to pass, ever, effective campaign finance reform. What, of course, the senior Senator meant by what he said, is that the augers have never been better to enact campaign reform.

Last year Congress sent a bill to the President. It was vetoed. This year we have a President in the White House who will sign a campaign reform bill into law.

Everyone knows all the tiresome statistics. One-half of $1 billion, $500 million, was spent during the 1992 campaign cycle. This is a $113 million increase in spending just since 1990. It now requires a Member running for the Senate to raise something like $12,000 a week in order to finance a campaign; on our side, it's up to $5,000 a week.

The statistics are on the books, Mr. Speaker. We need to cut back on campaign spending. We need now to put up or shut up on campaign reform.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION TO HONOR FALLEN BATF AGENTS

(Mr. LIGHTFOOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with my esteemed chairman of the Treasury and Postal Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to offer a resolution honoring the four fallen officers of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms who lost their lives in the confrontation in Waco, TX, which is continuing as we speak.

Every day the men and women of our law enforcement forces put their lives on the line to try and make our Nation a little safer. Most of these officers and those of us who rely on them to keep the peace are fortunate enough to have them return each day to continue that effort. Sadly, BATF agents Steve Willis, Robert J. Williams, Conway LeBleu, and Todd McKeehan will not be returning. It is up to us to make sure their sacrifice does not get lost in the sensationalism that inevitably surrounds a case like the standoff in Waco.

I hope that we have not become so used to violent crimes like this that we would allow ourselves to forget the price these men have paid. This resolution, of course, does not begin to make up for the loss to these agents' loved ones, and to the law enforcement community. But at least, through this measure, we can show them that we in Congress are profoundly grateful for their sacrifice, and are committed to remembering what they did in the line of duty.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my gratitude and deep admiration for those agents who have been wounded in the course of this confrontation. I know the chairman, Mr. HOYER, and I both want them to know that our prayers and thoughts are with them, and their families as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all my colleagues in the House to join the members of this subcommittee in supporting this resolution. It is one small, but worthy, part we can play in the effort to support the members of the BATF and the law enforcement community at large.

INTRODUCING RESOLUTION TO HONOR SOUTH KOREA'S FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS AND TO CONGRATULATE KIM YOUNG-SAM

(Mr. FOGLIETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today supporting the introduction of a resolution applauding the recent Presidential elections and peaceful transition of power in the Republic of South Korea. These elections represent a turning point in the nation's political history—a change driven by the Korean people toward a nonmilitary government.

Just before the recent elections, I went to South Korea. The streets of Seoul were filled with enthusiasm, optimism and the sights of democracy.

Contrast that to the 1987 Presidential elections. Those elections were held in order to calm the protests of the Korean people, but genuine democracy was missing. Roving secret agents silenced dissenters. Speech was not free. South Korea was still a police state.

South Korea's new President, Kim Young-sam, the first nonmilitary President in 30 years, pledges to end the dark political night of repression under the old order. I believe that he will, and he deserves our respect. So does the outgoing President for allowing the Democratic election process to proceed, and Kim Dae-jung, unsuccessful candidate and leader of the struggle for democracy in that country, for running a campaign he can be proud of.

Please join me in cosponsoring this resolution to congratulate South Korea and Kim Young-sam, himself a great leader for democratic change.

THE LINE-ITEM VETO COULD END DEMOCRAT GRIDLOCK

(Mr. BLUTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Clinton met with the Republican leadership of the Congress to try to show the American people that he is reaching out in order to gain acceptance for his economic program. I want to commend the President for being open to new ideas on deficit reduction. I am encouraged to hear that during yesterday's meetings the President was receptive to the idea of making more spending cuts to go along with his proposed tax increases.

However, I am distressed to hear that the President is doubtful that more cuts will ever be made because they would be unacceptable to the Congress. The President expressed frustration over a Congress that is unwilling to make additional spending cuts. Mr. Speaker, it looks to me that gridlock still exists in Washington, but the gridlock is not between Democrats and Republicans, the gridlock we see now is between a Democratic White House that seems to want to make more cuts and a Democrat-controlled Congress, which does not.

I sympathize with the President's frustration, but what I do not understand is that if the President is serious about wanting to do more to make cuts, why does he not come back up to this Hill and ask for the line-item veto authority that he campaigned on all across this country last year.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. President, show the leadership to come up to Capitol Hill and seize the line-item veto authority.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would remind Members again that they have to address the Chair. They cannot separately address the President or some other persons in Government.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED COMMUNITY ACTIVISTS OF ASPIRA

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of a dedicated group of professional educators and counselors going on this very moment in my home State of New Jersey. ASPIRA, Inc. is a nonprofit organization, providing counseling and leadership development programs to Hispanic and other minority youth. ASPIRA was founded 25 years ago by a group of Hispanic leaders and educators recognizing the need to ameliorate the alarming dropout rate among Puerto Rican youth within the State. Its mission became the strengthening of the Hispanic community's economic base by promoting education among its youth—thus creating the community's future leaders.

ASPIRA's mission of leadership through education reinforces a value for education; community awareness, and participation; a positive self-identity; the development of leadership skills; and parental awareness of educational programs and policies that affect their children.

ASPIRA's mission is symbolized by the pitirre, a small, fragile, tropical bird found on the island of Puerto Rico. It is known for its agility and rapid flight and for its ability to outsmart, tire, and defeat much larger birds. The pitirre represents ASPIRA and is symbolic of the youth who aspire to acquire knowledge and develop into future leaders. The Aspirante, like the pitirre, will overcome the seemingly overwhelming odds against them throughout life. It is through their struggle that they will gain the skills necessary to return and struggle for the betterment of their communities. I know my colleagues in the House join me in saluting ASPIRA.

□ 1310

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO INDEX FEDERAL INCOME TAXES TO REGIONAL COST OF LIVING

(Mr. LEVY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot from the administration these last few days about the need to use tax increases to erase part of the deficit. We have also heard about how those tax hikes should fall only on those who can most afford to pay.

Unfortunately, for too long, our country has defined those who are able to pay as being those with high incomes. We do not take into account the cost of living in the region where the taxpayer lives.

Who would argue, for example, with the premise that a taxpayer earning $45,000 in Dubuque is wealthier than a taxpayer earning $50,000 in Manhattan?

To address this issue, I have introduced H.R. 1157, a bill to index Federal income taxes to the regional cost of living. It is fair and would, for the first time, truly base our system of taxation on the taxpayers' ability to pay.

Information regarding this bill has been circulated to all of you, and I would urge your support.

CONCERN OVER HATCH ACT AMENDMENTS

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my comments today is to register my concern over passage of the Hatch Act amendments which will be before this body today.

The question before us is whether or not Government employees and their unions should be allowed to be even more active in electing, if you will, their employers. It is the Members of Congress who ultimately decide Federal employee wages, their fringe benefits, their retirement benefits, and in general whether Government expands or becomes even bigger and more powerful.

I would suggest that there is a conflict of interest between those of the taxpayers of this country and the public-employee organizations and their unions and their PAC's, their political action committees, that can influence and decide on the philosophy of Members of Congress that are going to ultimately increase taxes and increase those benefits.

CUT CONGRESSIONAL EXPENSES AND SUPPORT LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. TORKILDSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the current budget debate, President Clinton has asked for suggestions for additional cuts in the Federal budget. I come before the House today to weigh in with an opportunity to save taxpayers money and reduce the need for higher taxes. This is a cut that I am making voluntarily and one I hope my colleagues will join.

I propose an across-the-board cut of congressional expenses of 10-percent. It is time for Congress to take the lead in reducing spending. How can we ask Americans to sacrifice if we are unwilling to take the first step? We were elected as leaders in our communities and it is time for us to take action.

This 10-percent cut is a simple step that will go a long way in convincing the people that the Congress is serious.

In addition to this cut, there is another important step that we can take to reduce the budget deficit. We can give the President a line-item veto. The President has viewed this power favorably and we should give him this power to control spending. As Governor of Arkansas, he used the line-item veto effectively, and he should be given this management tool in Washington.

Last week I joined Democrats in supporting the much needed extension of unemployment benefits. Today, I urge my colleagues to join together in bipartisan support and pass a line-item veto measure. It is time to get the budget under control and we must lead now, before it is too late.

CUTS NECESSARY IN CONGRESS

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are now demanding that we in the Congress take serious steps to reduce Federal spending. They want specific cuts, and they want those cuts before tax increases. Ross Perot made this point in testimony yesterday, and the American people are making the point through phone calls and letters. They want specific cuts, not vague generalities. And they want us to start right here in the Congress.

One area where we can make real and immediate savings is by cutting our own congressional bureaucracy. A good first step in making Government leaner would be to cut back the number of our overlapping committees in the Congress, and to make substantial reductions in their funding levels. Mr. Perot has suggested deep cuts in committee funding. The freshman class on the Republican side of the aisle has called for 25-percent cuts this year, and 50 percent over the next 5 years.

By taking that simple step, we could cut more than $13 million from our budget this year alone. More importantly, we would take a big step toward proving to the people that we are willing to cut here first, before we move on to eliminate unnecessary committees, freeze overhead costs at the civilian agencies, sell off Government assets, and take the other steps that could save us hundreds of billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, before we even whisper the word "taxes," we must cut here in Congress.

RTC MUST BE ADEQUATELY FUNDED

(Mr. LAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the efforts of my freshman Republican colleagues to help illustrate the many opportunities for reducing spending in the Federal budget.

For my part, I want to advocate a rather unpopular and controversial proposal—to adequately fund the Resolution Trust Corporation as soon as possible. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that the RTC is not exactly the best run agency in our Government, but I also know that each day we delay will cost American taxpayers millions of dollars each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, the S&L debacle is going to cost the American people about $200 billion, and there are several reasons for this. Congress, for example, was lacking in its oversight responsibilities, perhaps because it was captured by special interests. But the principal reason for the S&L mess was regulatory forbearance, and the principal cause today for further running up the taxpayers' cost and exposure is involuntary regulatory forbearance. Put another way, in order to save money, and thereby reduce the deficit, we need to provide the RTC with the resources it needs to do its job to close down thrifts that continue to pile up huge taxpayer exposure and obligation. Mr. Speaker, this is an easy issue to demagog, but the budget and deficit implications are not in dispute. The choice is clear. We can pay now in order to pay less later, or we can continue to delay and force the taxpayer, our constituents, to pay hundreds of millions more in the future.

CRITICISM OF THE CLINTON PLAN

(Mr. CANADY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, Ross Perot has said, "I can't understand the details of the plan."

The columnist David Broder said, "President Clinton has a trust deficit."

Martin Feldstein, a Harvard economics professor, said of the Clinton plan:

> The projected increases in spending on social programs would far outweigh the proposed changes that would reduce spending or raise revenue, leaving the Nation with a wider deficit four years from now.

Are these people Republican partisans? No. Are they obstructionists? No.

Do they have significant problems with the Clinton plan for economic recovery?

Yes, they do, and for good reason. This plan needs to be seriously modified for it to be acceptable.

And to those who would equate fair criticism of this plan with a lack of patriotism, I say that patriotism is best exemplified by seriously studying the issues, not by meekly following the President. When the President is right, we should stand with him. But when the President is wrong, it is our duty to stand for what is right.

KEEP BAN ON IMMIGRANTS WITH AIDS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Energy and Commerce Committee, I attempted to offer an amendment to the NIH bill, which would have kept in place the existing ban on immigrants entering this country with the deadly AIDS virus. But due to a point of order which was raised, it was never considered.

But during debate on this companion bill over in the Senate, a similar amendment was overwhelmingly adopted. Overwhelmingly, by a vote of 76 to 23. Mr. Speaker, I am not a public health expert but common sense tells us that this disease is not like any other disease. AIDS is a communicable disease.

In my State of Florida, we already have one of the highest AIDS populations in the country. Mr. Speaker, our hospitals are already overburdened. And then, the crucial question is who is going to pay for their care? If we cannot even pay for treating our own citizens with AIDS, how can we pay for immigrants with this deadly disease? Keep in place the ban on immigrants entering this country with AIDS.

□ 1320

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ALLOW PENALTY-FREE WITHDRAWALS FROM IRA AND 401(k) ACCOUNTS

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which I believe would greatly stimulate our economy without appropriating any Government money.

My bill, H.R. 170, would allow for 1 year, unlimited penalty-free withdrawals from IRA and 401(k) accounts.

Further, this bill would allow 10 percent of these withdrawals to be done on a tax-free basis, giving people great incentive to participate.

There is presently more than $550 billion in these accounts. If 10 percent was pulled out and spent now, it would be a $55 billion boost to our economy.

This is not Government money. This is the people's own money.

If some of it is pulled out now, it will cost the Government some tax reve-

nues in the future. But this hit would be spread over several years, and years which hopefully will be better than now if we can get our fiscal house in order.

We all want people spending money on cars and homes and to invest in small businesses now, and conditions could be placed in this bill to require certain types of worthwhile immediate spending.

This is one way to stimulate our economy without increasing the deficit or raising taxes.

PROPOSED COST-SAVINGS PROPOSAL

(Mr. HUFFINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago with Americans shivering under the earliest chills of the cold war, Congress authorized support payments on wool.

Wool, it was argued, was a strategic material. Dependence on un-American wool was, well un-American. It would weaken our defense and leave us unfairly exposed to the naked aggression of the international marketplace.

This could be quaint, even amusing, if it weren't for one thing: The subsidy never stopped. In 1991, our subsidies artificially tripled the price of each pound of wool. The Congressional Budget Office reports that the elimination of this subsidy alone would save more than three-quarters of a billion dollars over the next 5 years.

We artificially raise the price of wool while American families cannot clothe their children. We spend precious tax dollars only to price ourselves out of the world market.

It is not the sheep that are being shorn by this absurdity, Mr. Speaker. It is the American taxpayer.

The President asked for specific spending cuts. I propose elimination of the wool and mohair subsidy.

GRIDLOCK, VOICELOCK

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, you know, we hear so much about gridlock in Washington, but we do not ever talk about voicelock. Yet today, in what should be the sacred hall of great debate and expression in the House, we will again stifle free speech and debate through an oppressive rule that will limit debate and all discussion on one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have addressed in this new session. That, of course, is the Hatch Act.

The rule, which is called 1-hour modified closed rule waiving all points of order, will simply derail true debate. In short, it means the majority of Members of this House, "Sit down, shut up, your ideas do not count, we do not want your amendments, we do not want your changes, we do not want your modifications."

We have 1 hour to debate a bill, a piece of law that is over 50 years old. I say it is time to end voicelock along with gridlock, open up the process, allow Members of the House to modify and amend bills, so that we can have honest and free debate in this sacred body.

NO MORE HOT AIR, SHOW ME WHERE

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, "No more hot air, show me where," is what President Clinton has said. A number of us are falling in line behind our friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], by being specific in making some proposed spending cuts. My office, like a lot of other offices, has been working on this.

They found that:

The USDA Export Enhancement Program provides direct taxpayer subsidies for the export of agricultural products to countries like China and the republics of the former Soviet Union. Eliminating this trade subsidy would save $3.15 billion.

The Bush administration requested cancellation of the advanced solid rocket motor, and NASA's aerospace safety advisory panel points out that the redesigned shuttle rocket motor is working well. Canceling this unnecessary program will save $1.65 billion.

If the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and South Korea assumed 75 percent of the cost of stationing American troops on their soil—the same percentage that Japan currently contributes—we would save $9.6 billion.

American troops are stationed in South Korea for 1 year, and are not accompanied by their family. In Western Europe they serve 3-year tours and bring their families. Placing most European tours on a 1-year unaccompanied schedule would save $1.8 billion.

That is not hot air, Mr. Speaker; we are being specific.

MODIFIED LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, everyone who has listened to the rhetoric on this floor in the past few weeks knows that the members of the U.S. Congress are recent converts to the religion of budget restraint.

I rise today to suggest that there is an easy way to test if the spending sinners of the U.S. Congress have truly been converted, or if once again, we are merely speaking in tongues.

That test is called the line-item veto.

Quite simply, if we are serious about reducing our deficit, I believe we must give the President the authority to eliminate waste and unnecessary spending, and we must give him this authority as soon as possible.

Today I am introducing a resolution to call for modified line-item veto legislation to be passed by July 30.

We have all heard a lot of preaching about this issue in this body and during the past election season—but now it is time to stop talking and to begin taking action.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution—a resolution that is our opportunity to prove that our budget restraint conversion is not temporary, but that we have become true believers.

THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN BURMA

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the rainy season is over in Southeast Asia, and again we expect that the world will be treated to the spectacle of the sight of troops of one of the most vicious dictatorships on the planet attacking the last remnants of the democracy movement in Burma. This country, Burma, has been under the heel of a vicious dictatorship; 45 million brave people live under this tyranny, one of the world's worst human abusers.

Aung San Suu Kyi, last year's Nobel Prize winner, still languishes under guard. People are arrested for daring to speak out against the military regime. The gangsters associated with the military regime plunder the country. The brave students who fought against the military in the struggle for democracy now are huddled with ethnic groups in jungle camps.

Mr. Speaker, these brave people are not forgotten. The cause of democracy in Southeast Asia will not be forgotten. That is our word to the people everywhere who are struggling for freedom, those people in Burma especially.

And, Mr. Speaker, to the gangsters who strangle freedom in Burma: They will be held accountable.

INFAMOUS CLOSED RULE

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the American people

realize what this closed rule business in the House of Representatives is all about. The concept of the Committee on Rules as setting the agenda for floor discussion, for discussion here, is that there is a committee that, before legislation comes here—and that is the concept—decides what is going to be discussed.

What has happened is that they put something called the closed rule on every bit of legislation that is going to come before this House. You know what the closed rule means? My colleague from Georgia mentioned it a few minutes ago. It means no discussion, no amendments, nobody here, nobody here even when this is full, can present an amendment to represent their constituents because of that thing called the closed rule.

That is profoundly undemocratic, Mr. Speaker. The American people have got to find out about it, they have got to put the pressures on the leadership of this institution to undo and do away once and for all with that most undemocratic principle, most undemocratic practice called and known as the infamous closed rule.

□ 1330

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT OF 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 106 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 106

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 20) to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 106 provides for consideration of H.R. 20, the Federal Employees Political Activities Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate time equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration and makes in order only those amendments printed in the report to accompany the rule. These amendments are to be considered in the order and manner specified in the report and by the named proponent. The amendments shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The amendments are not subject to amendment and are not subject to a demand for a division of the question. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit which may contain instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 20 would restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation. The bill provides that Federal employees, acting as private citizens, may engage in any legal political activity off the job. They may run for partisan political office without taking leave, as long as the campaigning does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

The bill permits employees to request leave without pay or annual leave to run for political office and provides that such requests be granted unless the agency management determines that the demand of public business requires that leave be denied. The legislation also permits Federal employees to manage political campaigns and to raise campaign money during off-duty hours.

Finally, the bill would also protect Federal civilian employees from improper political solicitations and contains prohibitions against coercion. The bill specifies that Federal employees cannot use official authority or influence to interfere with the result of an election or to intimidate any individual to vote or not to vote, to give or withhold a contribution, or to engage or not engage in any political activity.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 20 will allow Federal employees for the first time in over 50 years to participate in political activity and House Resolution 106 is a fair rule that will expedite consideration of this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we sounded a clarion call to the American people—a wake-up call as to what is happening to their Government down here in Washington since they voted for a new Congress and President just 4 short months ago this week.

The American people thought they voted for change. They thought they voted to take back their Government. They thought they voted to restore democracy and put the people back in control of the people's House.

Well, I have sad news to announce to the American people today. If you want to know what the score here is in the people's House, let me put it in the simplest terms I can. Here is today's democracy box score: The people, zero; tyranny, five.

Yes, you heard me right. The people are down five to zero in their own House. That's a shutout in any game you play. Only we are not supposed to be playing games here. We are supposed to be legislating for the people and the good of the Nation.

Nevertheless, the people are being shut out in their own House for the fifth straight time in this Congress. This is the fifth restrictive rule out of five rules granted in which amendments have been severely limited if not denied altogether.

Prior to this Hatch Act bill the Rules Committee granted restrictive rules on the family and medical leave bill, on which only three amendments were allowed; the motor-voter bill, on which just one amendment was allowed; the family planning bill, on which just one amendment was allowed; and the unemployment compensation bill on which no amendments were allowed.

And now today, on this Federal Employees Political Activities Act, we have made in order just three amendments, even though a total of nine amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee.

Not only did the Rules Committee deny Representative WOLF of Virginia an opportunity to offer all four of the amendments he had submitted, it also denied one of its own majority Democrats, Mr. FOGLIETTA of Pennsylvania, his amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee yesterday, we offered an open rule, and all but one Democrat voted against

that motion. That same Democrat, Mr. BEILENSON, voted with us to make the four Wolf amendments in order.

The Foglietta amendment went down on a party-line vote—sandbagged by his own fellow Democrats. Following my remarks I will include a summary of each of the amendments denied and the rollcall vote on those amendments, as well as the text of our open rule and the rollcall vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, why are the people the real losers in this? The reason is very simple.

Every time we deny an open amendment process on an important piece of legislation, we are disenfranchising the people and their Representatives from the legislative process.

The people and their Representatives are not even being treated as second-class citizens; they might as well not be citizens at all given how little impact they have on shaping legislation in the House.

If that is not undemocratic, I would like to know what is. The opposite of democracy is tyranny—and that is precisely what is at work in this House of Representatives today.

Is the word tyranny too strong for some of my colleagues? Do you think it cannot happen here? Well, you need look no farther than "Jefferson's Manual" or the Federalist Papers to know that one of the things the Founders most feared was a tyranny of the majority.

Jefferson observed that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration and those who acted with the majority "than a neglect of or departure from, the rules of proceeding," which were designed as a "shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power."

And Jefferson went on to warn that these rules of proceeding are the only weapons the minority has to defend itself against

Those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the farther you and your leadership stray from the regular order around here, the more you are instituting a new order which is not democracy by any definition.

It is a new oligarchy and tyranny which will some day cause the people to topple this House if we don't bring it down on ourselves first.

If you want to talk about term limits, you are well on your way to self-imposing one on yourself, whether you like it or not. The people are sick and tired of this political gamesmanship. They want back into their own House and they want it open and democratic, not closed and dictatorial.

Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken to the merits of the bill this rule makes in order because I happen to favor this bill. But that is not what is at issue here. If it is a good bill, as I think it is, it should be able to withstand the scrutiny and debate that comes through an open amendment process.

I suggested one amendment in the Rules Committee which I think would further improve the legislation as far as State employees who receive Federal funds. It would have allowed them to run for any office. But that was denied.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to add insult to outrage, the Rules Committee reconvened late yesterday afternoon to further amend this rule by waiving all points of order against the bill and against its consideration.

It seems the bill creates a new entitlement program and thereby violates at least three provisions of the Congressional Budget Act. We have no letter from the Budget Committee chairman supporting or opposing these waivers.

But that did not stop the Rules Committee from throwing the Budget Act out the window.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion that we will once again give a majority of this House an opportunity to strike a blow for democracy and openness by voting down the previous question so that we can offer an open rule.

Let us start to turn that democracy box score around and put the people back in the winning column. Vote "no" on the previous question so that you can vote "yes" for freedom and democracy in this, the people's House.

H. RES. 106

(Providing for the Consideration of H.R. 20, the Federal Employees Political Activities Act.)

AN AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON PROVIDING FOR AN OPEN RULE

Strike all after the revolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 20) to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.".

Explanation: This amendment to the proposed rule (H. Res. 106) provides for a 1-hour, open rule for the consideration of H.R. 20, the "Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1993."

AMENDMENTS TO THE RULE ON H.R. 20—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT

1. Open rule—An amendment in the nature of a substitute for a 1-hour, open rule. Vote (defeated 4–6); Yeas—Beilenson, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier; Nays—Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Gordon, Slaughter.

2. Wolf (C)—Strike provisions in the bill which allows for exemptions. Vote (defeated 4–6); Yeas—Beilenson, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier; Nays—Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

3. Wolf (D)—Give broad protection to federal employees. One employee could not solicit another to participate in campaign activities. Vote (defeated 4–5); Yeas—Beilenson, Solomon, Quillen, Nays—Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

4. Wolf (A)—Retain Hatch Act for law enforcement, intelligence and senior executive service personnel. Vote (defeated 4–5); Yeas—Beilenson, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier; Nays—Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

5. Wolf (B)—Retain Hatch Act for Federal Election Commission, Merit Systems Protection Board and Office of Special Counsel. Vote (defeated 4–5); Yeas—Beilenson, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier; Nays—Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

6. Foglietta—Retain Hatch Act for law enforcement personnel. Vote (defeated 4–6); Yeas—Beilenson, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier; Nays—Moakley, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter.

7. Adoption of restrictive rule. Vote (passed 7–3); Yeas—Moakley, Derrick, Bonior, Hall, Wheat, Slaughter, Quillen; Nays—Solomon, Dreier, Goss.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 95TH–103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent
95th (1977–78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979–80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981–82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983–84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985–86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987–88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989–90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991–92)	109	37	34	72	66

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES, 95TH–103D CONG.—Continued

Congress (years)	Total rules granted [1]	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent
103d (1993–94)	5	0	0	5	100

[1] Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

[2] Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th–102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Mar. 2, 1993.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES—103d CONG.

Rule number, date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58 2/2/93	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D–5; R–25)	3 (D–0; R–3)	PQ: 246–176, A: 259–164 (2/3/93).
H. Res. 59 2/3/93	MC	H.R. 2: Motor voter	9 (D–1; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	PQ: 248–171, A: 249–170 (2/4/93).
H. Res. 81 2/16/93	MC	H.R. 6: Family planning	8 (D–0; R–8)	1 (D–0; R–1)	
H. Res. 103 2/23/93	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D–2; R–5)	0	PQ: 243–172, A: 237–178 (2/24/93).
H. Res. 106 3/2/93	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D–1; R–8)	3 (D–0; R–3)	

Note.—C—closed; MC—modified closed; MO—modified open; O—open; D—Democrat; R—Republican; PQ: Previous question; A—adopted; R—rejected.

□ 1340

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair wishes to remind Members that they cannot address Members back in their offices. They have to address the Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask, was the Chair addressing me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a parliamentary point. The gentleman knows the rules. He cannot address Members back in their offices. He should address the Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Speaker for reminding me. I know that, and I thought I did. If I did not, I will pay more attention in the future.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and Mr. Speaker, I am addressing these remarks to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I will accept them.

Mr. DERRICK. I want the Chair to know why we do not propose an open rule. The House last week rejected H.R. 20 during consideration under Suspension of the Rules. This bill in its present form received 275 votes last week.

The rule before us today makes in order three Republican amendments to address concerns of the Members. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, and each of the three amendments, if offered, is debatable for 30 minutes, thus allowing ample time for discussion.

There is no need to go through a long and cumbersome amendment process for a bill that obviously has enormous bipartisan support. In the 101st Congress the House passed a nearly identical bill by a vote of 334 to 87 and then went on to override the President's veto by a vote of 327 to 93. The Senate veto override was 65 to 35, an overwhelming margin, but short of two-thirds.

In the 100th Congress, the House passed basically the same bill that we have before us today, by a vote of 305 to 112. And I would also like to remind our previous speaker that he withdrew the amendment that he mentioned which was not made in order. Quite frankly, there is a strong possibility we would have made it in order had he not withdrawn it. But that is a part of the scenario he did not recount for us.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, yield?

Mr. DERRICK. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is a true Southern gentleman, and I knew he would.

I would just say this to the gentleman: We are in session this week, as we were last week, as we were last week and the week before and the week before that. This week the only legislation we have before us is this so-called repeal of the Hatch Act.

Mr. DERRICK. And it is a very important piece of legislation that has disenfranchised millions of Americans.

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes. And that is why I am one of the cosponsors of that legislation.

Mr. DERRICK. And I would point out that I, too, support the legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentleman that there is a divergence of opinion here on both sides of the aisle, among Democrats and Republicans alike, who do not want to see the bill watered down to the extent it is. I do not agree with that. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], who has been very, very active on this issue for as long as I can remember, had four totally germane amendments which he wished to offer. They could be debated for a ½-hour each for a total of 2 hours. But they were denied, and they were germane amendments. They were amendments which retain the Hatch Act for law enforcement, intelligence, and senior executive service personnel.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that I am delighted to yield time to him, but not for the purpose of making a speech. If the gentleman wants to do that, let me say that I have other Members on this side who want to participate in the discussion, and I would suggest the gentleman use his own time.

□ 1350

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask the gentleman honestly, and I am not trying to embarrass him——

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am not embarrassed at all.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman why were these amendments not made in order? We were not given reasons up in the Committee on Rules, and they are germane to the issue. They deserve to be debated on the floor.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman allow me to answer the question he just asked?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I did not get to the end of the question. The question is, we do not have anything to do for the rest of the afternoon. It is 2 o'clock. We are going to finish this up around 4 o'clock. We do not have anything to do tomorrow, Thursday. We have nothing to do Friday. There are no rules pending and no business scheduled for this floor.

Why could we not just make these four amendments in order and have legitimate debate?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not want to be impolite, but I yielded the gentleman time as a courtesy, not for him to make a long harangue against the Democratic leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] may not have anything to do, but I have something to do and most other Members of this body have something to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the original question as to why this rule was structured in this manner. The reason is because almost identical bills have passed the House by a nearly or more than two-thirds majority on

three different occasions, which indicates that a majority of the House, about two-thirds, a bipartisan majority, a large majority, support it.

There were three amendments made in order. As I said, quite frankly, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] had not withdrawn his amendment, there probably would have been four in order.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day of the session that reminds me of the last 4. We degenerate a little bit and start talking about rodents. It brings back old times.

I support, first of all, the rule, and I support the bill. And I support and commend the efforts of our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], who has been persistent.

The truth is today Federal employees are treated like second-class citizens. Federal workers are constantly being beat up by politicians whenever it suits their fancy. In fact, their pay is always criticized, their benefits are constantly being threatened, and their politics and partisanship is constantly a threat to politicians, which many fear.

I think today it is time to face the facts: Federal workers have been threatened in America unconstitutionally. Today it is time to hatch the Constitution and to hatch some rights in the Constitution for American citizens who happen to be Federal workers.

Now, let me say this: If a Federal worker has to be subject to the rules, regulations, and laws of the politicians, then a Federal worker should have the right to support the candidates of their choice without breaking the law, period.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I will not get into this rodentia locutare discussion, but I appreciate the time, and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would notify the handlers of this resolution that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 20 minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, a new member that we welcomed aboard this year.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman cannot display as much anguish as the ranking member. As a minority member of the Rules Committee, I wonder what positive contribution the four Republicans on that panel are really able to provide. I am not yet ready to declare myself just a potted palm, but the fact is there are nine Democrats and votes are never held when the majority is not assured of victory. I know we in the minority serve well as watchdogs and do provide for serious debate on the issues. But when our meetings end, the predetermined agenda set by the majority leadership always prevails. People in our Nation need to know this and indeed, to his credit, the Speaker has publicly confirmed that the Rules Committee is the tame captive of the majority whose function is to ensure the majority's agenda. So let us not pretend—this is not a bipartisan rule and neither have been any of the other closed rules we have worked under this session. Today we have a rule that is primarily closed, even though we actually will get to discuss three minor amendments. But there were seven other amendments offered, from both sides of the aisle, that we will not be allowed to consider on this floor today—a couple of them of potentially great significance. Why? Is our schedule so crowded in the House that time will simply not allow full and open debate on this issue? No, in fact this bill is the only major new legislative business being considered this week. Were those seven amendments obstructionist, peripheral or designed to gut this bill? No, in fact they went to the heart of a matter many people are concerned about—ensuring that we prevent abuse and do not encourage misuse of official power or position under this bill.

During our discussion, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was asked the central question—why oppose an open rule? The answer came back that an open rule would not be appropriate because the chairman of the Post Office Committee felt that the Congress should not consider the substance of some of the amendments being offered.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans should have equal representation on this floor in considering important matters. For chairmen of committees to favor closed rules to shut out amendments they disagree with is to close off the rights of Members and their constituents to decide for themselves on the merits of any particular amendment.

Even some of the majority members of the Rules Committee are becoming uncomfortable with the role they are being asked to play in this strong-arming process. The majority leadership should remember that Americans have given this institution failing marks and they are tired of the arrogance of power that pervades the leadership circles of this institution.

That being said, let me conclude by saying that I support H.R. 20. Having once been a Federal employee who was "Hatched" under existing law, I felt that my right to participate fully in the political process was being infringed. I felt unfairly disenfranchised as I know do many Federal employees today.

In my opinion, this bill corrects a wrong, but there could possibly be better protection in it to control abuse and coercion. That is why I support an open rule—because there were amendments proposed to deal with the potential for abuse under this legislation and all Members of this House should have a chance to consider those issues in full and open debate. We could only come out ahead if we let the democratic process work fairly. I urge a "no" vote on this restrictive rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the debate here seems not to center on the merits of this legislation, which has overwhelming support in this Chamber as was demonstrated just a few hours ago; rather, the debate seems to be stemmed around whether or not we have a lot of time on our hands, whether or not this process is being slam-dunked against the will of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say about this in general debate, but I want to point out to Members that this bill will be 20 years old next year. This issue has received dozens of hearings for 20 years. This is not the first time, as Members on both sides of the aisle know, that this issue has come before this body and been passed by this House.

A slam-dunk? Hardly. After 20 years, some kind of a violation of the rights of people to be heard? Hardly.

The violation that is going on in this country is the violation of the rights of Federal workers. We are herein after 20 years of debate and discussion trying to resolve that matter on behalf of Federal workers.

Mr. Speaker, what I think we are getting from the other side under the guise, of somehow, they are claiming running rampant over their rights, what we are getting is delay, obfuscation, disagreement, slowdown, drag your feet, just another few years. The American people have come to know it as gridlock, and they would like it to end.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, how could there be gridlock when the Democrats have an 82-vote majority? Where is the gridlock?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

We were told, Mr. Speaker, that this is a fair rule, and that has since been elaborated upon by the gentleman from South Carolina and others, that it is a fair rule because we do not have time to legislate in this body. We have other

more important things to do. There are other things that Members have to be doing other than being on the floor legislating. So it is entirely fair to come to the floor with closed rules on a consistent basis.

I want my colleagues to take a look at this. I came to Congress in the 95th Congress. At that time over 80 percent of the rules that we got from the House floor were open rules, and we did our business pretty well. We had good legislation that managed to move forward.

Since that time, open rules have deteriorated to the point that they are down to about 20 percent. And in the meantime, closed rules, that used to be a minor portion, have gone clear up and now are on a trend line almost up like a rocketship.

This is not just a matter of this particular closed rule. It is closed rule after closed rule.

Why should the middle class of America be concerned about us debating about the rules, some rule out here? The middle class ought to be concerned because let me tell my colleagues the kind of amendments that will not come to the floor.

Under this bill, that we are not allowed to amend, an IRS agent can show up at a middle-class person's home the night before they are to be audited, suggesting "You ought to contribute $500" to their favorite candidate and, "Oh, by the way, if you don't make your contribution, remember, you are going to have to come in and see me in the morning."

That is the kind of outrage that can be permitted under the bill we are about to take up. And we cannot offer amendments to do something about that.

Middle-class America has everything to fear when tyranny begins to dominate the legislative process that allows them to have their voice. That is what is happening. It is not just tyranny; it is petty tyranny.

The bill was defeated on suspension the other day largely to give the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] his opportunity to offer amendments on the floor. And what happened in the Committee on Rules, in an act of absolute pettiness, in an act of vindictiveness, the Committee on Rules said, "Mr. Wolf, we are not even going to give you one amendment," despite the fact that it was understood that the bill was largely defeated on suspension to give the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] his opportunity to make his case on the floor.

The petty tyranny that exists in the Committee on Rules decided that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] should be taught a lesson, should be shut out. Every amendment he had was entirely germane to the bill, but his amendments were shut out.

That is the kind of thing which has become a true outrage in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, the scenario about the IRS agent that affects middle-class America, who arrives the night before, that can happen now and certainly it could happen under this bill. But they are going to be put in jail on both occasions.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and hope, as I rise in support of this rule, Mr. Speaker, that I do not resort to hysteria.

The gentleman just explained that the example of the IRS agent is a violation of law now, if he did it, and would be a violation of law under this bill. And there is no evidence whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that the bill that was defeated last week by 3 votes, 275 to 142, 275 voting for the bill on a suspension, there is no evidence that the primary reason for the defeat of that bill was to permit the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] to offer any amendment whatsoever.

My thinking about offering amendments, Mr. Speaker, is that we offer amendments in an effort to improve the legislation. And if we are permitted to offer all of our amendments and all of our amendments pass, that means that we have now an ideal piece of legislation and we would support it.

Well, I understand that at the Committee on Rules, when the question was asked of the sponsor of those four amendments, if they passed and were included in the bill, would he support this piece of legislation, the answer was no. Then there is some other reason for offering these motions and these amendments.

Let me say to my colleagues that my reason for objecting to the offering of the amendment is that in my opinion it was not necessary for us to decide, again, after 19 years on this bill and passing it numerous times, I do not think that we ought to be in a position of further trying to deny 3 million Federal and postal employees a constitutional right that is guaranteed to all citizens under the first amendment. And that amendment that they are talking about that the gentleman wanted to offer would exclude thousands of American citizens in good standing, law abiding, from participating in the electoral process of this country.

I think it is tragic that any Member would want to deny another citizen the right to participate in politics. I think that it is unnecessary for us to have a question of whether we do or whether we do not want to let American citizens, some 3 million of them, participate in politics.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. This rule provides for full debate of all relevant issues. Specifically, the rule makes in order three amendments. It permits an amendment that would prohibit employees of the Federal Election Commission from engaging in partisan political activity. The rule permits an amendment to provide that, while Federal and postal employees may run for local elective public office, they will be precluded from running for statewide or Federal public office.

Finally, the rule permits an amendment that substantially limits the ability of Federal employees to solicit campaign contributions. Under this amendment, a Federal employee may only solicit, accept, or receive a campaign contribution if three conditions are met. First, the employee must be a member of a Federal employee or labor organization. Second, the employee may only solicit, accept, or receive a campaign contribution from a fellow member of that organization. Finally, the employee may only solicit, accept, or receive a contribution on behalf of the multicandidate political committee of that organization. This amendment prohibits a Federal employee from soliciting, accepting, or receiving any campaign contributions from any subordinate employee. And the amendment prohibits all Federal employees from soliciting, accepting, or receiving campaign contributions from any member of the general public.

A few Members have expressed concern that by somehow lifting the restrictions the Hatch Act places on the basic rights of Federal employees, we are going to unleash a torrent of coercion and intimidation. These Members apparently feel that, notwithstanding the prohibitions in H.R. 20, Federal employees will intentionally seek to violate the law and abuse their official position. I think Federal employees are honest, responsible citizens who take seriously their obligations and duties and fulfill those obligations with honor and credit. To the extent that some may think otherwise, however, this amendment addresses those concerns once and for all by prohibiting solicitation of any member of the public, any subordinate employee, and any Federal employee who is not a fellow member of a Federal employee organization.

Assuming this body adopts the amendments that will be offered, and I will not oppose these amendments, there is no reasonable or logical basis for still opposing this bill. One either believes that Federal employees should be able to voice their views regarding the politics of the Nation or one doesn't. This rule also permits a motion to recommit and there will be an up-or-down vote on final passage.

To claim that the majority is somehow trampling on the rights of the minority by not allowing for an unlimited series of gutting amendments is ludicrous. Most Members advocating filibuster by the amendment route have no intention of supporting the bill on final passage in any case. We have had

12 years of gridlock and delay. This rule permits consideration by the House of all points of view regarding this legislation. This rule also ensures that the House will ultimately be able to act one way or the other. I commend the Rules Committee for its efforts and urge support of the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia [Mr. WOLF], who has a long history of involvement in constructive contribution to this debate.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there is an abuse of power in this body that is beginning to corrupt the process. Since the beginning of this congressional session, the House Rules Committee has not allowed one open rule whereby members of either party can offer amendments. This prohibits free and open discussion of ideas and issues that are important to the American people. Both Republican and Democrat Members are becoming increasingly frustrated over their inability to offer amendments and participate in the legislative process.

Every morning when I come to work I think about how fortunate I am to have the opportunity to represent the honorable citizens of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, and to serve my country as a Member of Congress. Indeed every Member of this body should be proud to have been granted, by the collective will of their constituents, this unique opportunity to come to Washington and make a positive difference. Today, however, I am disappointed that I will not be allowed to offer amendments to a bill which I feel is seriously flawed.

My amendments were not designed to be dilatory or obstructionist amendments. They were substantive amendments which addressed issues of real concern to many Members and the American people. One amendment that I would have offered would have kept current Hatch Act restrictions on the Federal Election Commission, Merit System Protection Board, Office of Special Counsel, and U.S. attorneys. The employees who work in these sensitive positions address issues that are political in nature, and their involvement in partisan political activity could severely undermine public confidence in our administrative processes. Would it be appropriate for an assistant U.S. attorney, who is preparing a case against a prominent political figure for corruption, to be permitted to work on the campaign of that politician's opponent? Repeal of the Hatch Act raises serious questions of conflict of interest and denial of due process. A closed rule does not address these concerns.

Another amendment that I would have offered would have kept current Hatch Act restrictions on employees involved in law enforcement and national security. Mr. Speaker, few would be content knowing an employee of the IRS was president or chairman of the county Democratic or Republican committee at night, and auditing county residents' tax returns by day. If publicly partisan FBI agents were investigating alleged bribery charges, or better yet, conducting a sting operation of a politician the agent publicly opposed, would the investigation, regardless of how forthrightly, professionally, and carefully conducted, be questioned as to the integrity of the investigation. Mr. Speaker, a closed rule does not address these serious questions.

Lastly, I would have offered an amendment that would have offered broad protections to the dedicated men and women of our civil service. The amendment would have prevented a Federal employee from soliciting another employee to take part in political management or campaigning. Thus, this amendment would have addressed the concern about indirect political coercion that would adversely effect Federal employees subjected to such harassment. The very real concern about indirect political coercion will not be addressed because Members of this House have been gagged by a closed rule. These issues need to be discussed, particularly because we are contemplating overturning a policy that has been in effect since the days of Thomas Jefferson and will affect the lives of about 3 million Federal employees.

This legislation is controversial and deserves deliberate consideration by this body. Leading newspapers and watchdog groups have raised serious concerns about the possible negative implications of repealing the Hatch Act. The Philadelphia Inquirer editorialized that:

> If [political] involvements were allowed, the public's respect for federal workers, such as it is, would surely decline. At the same time, more and more employees would feel improper pressure to be politically active in their spare time.

The Los Angeles Times wrote:

> Many federal employees have welcomed the prohibitions. The act excuses them from "voluntary" political activity that, given their vulnerability to actions by elected officials, might easily be coerced.

The Wall Street Journal commented:

> This country replaced the spoils system with a civil service system more than 100 years ago. That system certainly has its problems, but at least its employees don't openly play politics.

Lastly, Common Cause opposes repealing the Hatch Act stating:

> Repeal of the Hatch Act's basic protections, as proposed in H.R. 20, will increase the potential for widespread abuse and open the way for implicit coercion against which there can be no real protection.

Mr. Speaker, a closed rule will not allow members to address these concerns in a deliberative fashion. I have enclosed the text of these editorials and Common Cause's letter for the RECORD.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 1, 1993]

LET THE HATCH ACT BE

If the Democrats in Congress are going to pass bad bills, they should at least follow good procedure. That means allowing debate and amendments. Yet when the House took up a major bill last week, members not only couldn't amend it, they had virtually no time to debate it. In short, the representatives of the people were under a gag rule. It looked as if the Democrats don't like democracy.

The bill in question would have gutted a 54-year-old law—the Hatch Act—that bars federal workers from running for political office and from engaging in other partisan activities. It was enacted to make the bureaucracy less hack-riddled and to insulate federal workers from partisan pressures. Generally speaking, it has worked.

Fortunately, the bill didn't quite garner the two-thirds majority needed to pass it under this arrangement. Thus the bill will get the extensive debate that it deserves, and lawmakers will now have an opportunity to improve it by amendment.

Since President Clinton and majorities in both houses of Congress clearly want to soften the current law, the question isn't whether to do it, but how far to go. The legislation that was nearly rammed through the House last week would have gone way too far. In allowing federal employees to work off-hours in political campaigns, for example, the bill doesn't even exclude people who work for the Federal Election Commission (FEC)—the watchdog agency for congressional and presidential campaigns. As pointed out by someone whose district includes lots of federal employees, Rep. Frank Wolf (R., Va.), that would let an FEC employee do moonlighting work for a congressional candidate, then audit the financial report on the candidate's opponent by day.

Mr. Wolf also argues that the ban on campaign work should be maintained as well for employees of the Justice Department, the CIA and other law-enforcement and intelligence agencies. He reasons that, in such areas, it's especially important that decision-making be free of even the possibility of being influenced by partisan consideration. We agree.

But even if such exceptions were made, we fail to see the compelling argument for freeing the rest of America's roughly 3 million federal workers and postal employees to leap into politics—letting them participate in campaigns and, without giving up their relatively secure positions, even run for office themselves. If such involvements were allowed, the public's respect for federal workers, such as it is, would surely decline. At the same time, more and more employees would feel improper pressure to be politically active in their spare time.

These are basic reasons why the Hatch Act is being defended by the ACLU, Common Cause—and many federal employees themselves. If it's not broke, why rush to fix it? For that matter, why fix it at all?

[From the Los Angeles Times]

AN UNWANTED ESCAPE HATCH

Federal employees, like all Americans, have the right to vote, to belong to a political party and to make monetary contributions to candidates. For 53 years, however, federal employees have been wisely barred

from further political activity. They may not serve as officers in a political party or manage political campaigns or work as volunteers in a candidate's campaign office. They may not solicit contributions from others for a candidate. And, not least in importance, they may not themselves run for elected office.

These restrictions have been the law of the land since 1939 when the Hatch Act, named for Sen. Carl Hatch (D–N.M.), was passed.

Many federal employees have welcomed the prohibitions. The act excuses them from "voluntary" political activity that, given their vulnerability to actions by elected officials, might easily be coerced. The law also preserves public respect for the Civil Service by keeping it clearly and formally above politics.

But opposition to the Hatch Act has never subsided. It has been thrice challenged, and thrice upheld, before the Supreme Court. In 1975 and 1990, Congress passed—and Presidents Gerald R. Ford and George Bush vetoed—bills for its repeal.

Behind the challenges have been federal employee unions, notably the National Assn. of Letter Carriers, which have used their political influence with Democratic legislators against the Hatch Act.

A great many federal employees have been Democrats, and so Democratic legislators, the merits of the case aside, have a partisan reason to be sympathetic.

Minority group members are disproportionately numerous among federal employees as well, and one among the arguments for repealing the Hatch Act has been that it reduces minority political power. Broadly speaking, the federal employees' right to an irreducible minimum of political activity does need to be balanced with the taxpayers' right to be preserved from, in effect, funding their own employees' lobbying.

A new bill to revise the Hatch Act, currently before Congress, would destroy that balance, going so far as to permit employees of the Federal Election Commission, which monitors enforcement of election laws, to work in electoral campaigns.

Refinements of the act may well be possible, but any proposed changes should be scrutinized skeptically. This is a law that has served the public good for half a century. Repealing it or even seriously weakening it should be out of the question.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 19, 1993]

HATCH NOT HACKS

One of President Clinton's few real spending cuts is his pledge to reduce the federal work force through attrition by 100,000 over four years. But he is unlikely to accomplish that if he goes along with an effort by Congress to destroy the Hatch Act, which limits the political activity of federal workers. Such a move would dramatically increase the power of public employee unions and make it less likely that Congress would ever vote to streamline or reform the bureaucracy.

The Hatch Act, named after Democratic Senator Carl Hatch of New Mexico, was passed in 1939 to tighten longstanding protections against a politicized federal work force. A Pulitzer Prize-winning series had documented how New Deal workers in Kentucky and other states had been coerced into supporting political incumbents.

Since its enactment, Hatch has been challenged three times before the Supreme Court on the grounds it infringes on the rights of workers. Each time it has been upheld. In 1973, Justice Byron White, the only Democratic appointee now on the court, wrote in an opinion that "it is in the best interest of the country, indeed essential, that * * * the political influence of federal employees on others and on the political process should be limited."

Frustrated by the courts, federal employee unions have time and again tried to modify the Hatch Act. Joe Vacca, the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, has said that federal employees will never win the right to strike until Hatch is changed. In 1975, President Ford vetoed a Hatch Act repeal. In 1990, President Bush did the same thing and the Senate narrowly upheld his veto.

Last year, Bill Clinton said he would support some changes in the Hatch Act but stopped short of calling for its repeal. Public employee unions are betting he will be unwilling to veto whatever bill passes Congress. A bill to gut the Hatch Act is moving through Congress at warp speed and has already been voted out of committee. It may reach the House floor as early as next Tuesday.

Ironically, there is precious little evidence that federal workers themselves want changes in the Hatch Act. A 1989 survey of federal employees by the Merit Systems Protection Board found that only 32% wanted the act weakened. There are sound reasons for this attitude. "When a civil servant says, 'I'm Hatched,' he is not complaining," says historian Marjorie Fribourg. "He is protecting himself from political arm-twisting." Indeed, one federal employee union official groused in 1990 that "some federal employees really hide behind the Hatch Act as a way to get out of participating" in politics.

Groups such as Common Cause oppose curbing the Hatch Act, because they recognize it is the only way to avoid turning federal unions into full-fledged partisan political machines. Three union presidents were suspended from their federal jobs for 60 days under Hatch for openly backing Walter Mondale in 1984.

This country replaced the spoils system with a civil service more than 100 years ago. That system certainly has its problems, but at least its employees don't openly play politics. Bill Clinton would be foolish to allow the civil service to become a giant lobby for its own self-interest. But should he cave in and sign a bill gutting the Hatch Act, he should have the honesty to rename it the Hack Act, because that is the direction a politicized civil service will inevitably take.

COMMON CAUSE,
Washington, DC, February 19, 1993.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House of Representatives is scheduled next week to consider legislation to amend the Hatch Act which for 50 years has protected federal employees from inappropriate political pressures. Common Cause strongly urges you to oppose this legislation.

H.R. 20, which seeks to make basic changes in the current Hatch Act restrictions on partisan political activity by federal workers, opens the door to implicit coercion, and abandons the fundamental concept of an unpoliticized civil service.

H.R. 20 will repeal Hatch Act protections and for the first time in 50 years allow federal civil service and postal employees to actively participate in partisan political activity. It would permit federal workers to run as candidates in partisan elections, to serve as officers of a political party, to raise partisan campaign contributions, manage campaigns, and to administer political action committees (PACs). The only restraint is that the partisan activity would have to occur in off-hours.

Repeal of the Hatch Act's basic protections, as proposed in H.R. 20, will increase the potential for widespread abuse and open the way for implicit coercion against which there can be no real protection. With basic restrictions on partisan activity repealed, no procedural or other safeguards will be sufficient to protect against subtle forms of political favoritism or coercion of federal workers.

It is important to recognize that under the current Hatch Act, federal workers are already permitted to engage in certain political activities. For example, they may make political contributions to candidates, serve as rank-and-file members of political parties, and engage in nonpartisan political activities. It is only the most active levels of partisan participation from which they are currently barred. In drawing this line, we believe that the current Hatch Act strikes an appropriate balance between the federal worker's ability to participate in political activities and the public's right to fair and impartial administration of government.

Common Cause recognizes that the current regulations governing administration of the Hatch Act are complicated. There may be ways to clarify and simplify for workers the degree of participation they are permitted under the Hatch Act without lifting the basic restrictions on partisan activity. We would urge the House to instead explore this possibility.

The Hatch Act was designed to ensure that the federal government is administered in a fair and impartial manner. We agree with the U.S. Supreme Court which stated, in upholding the constitutionality of the Act, that "it is in the best interest of the country, indeed essential, that federal service should depend upon meritorious performance rather than political service."

Common Cause strongly believes this important integrity-in-government measure should not be repealed. We urge you to oppose H.R. 20 and other proposals that would repeal necessary prohibitions on partisan political activity by federal employees.

Sincerely,

FRED WERTHEIMER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed because this House has degenerated into a place where open and honest debate is abhorred, political dialogue is silenced, expressions of conflicting views are muzzled, opinions are censured, and independence of thought is rebuked. Mr. Speaker, I am also disappointed because this House has demonstrated its contempt for the very democratic principles upon which this country was founded.

Yesterday, I had the most disturbing experience of my tenure as a Congressman. I testified before the Rules Committee and asked that they approve an open rule to H.R. 20, a bill that would repeal the Hatch Act of 1939. No open rule was granted; however, three amendments by my Republican colleagues were made in order. There is no valid explanation for why I was denied an opportunity to offer even one of my three perfecting amendments. Because I would not succumb to the leadership's plan to pass H.R. 20 under sus-

pension of the rules and because I would not restrain my views with regard to this bill, I can only assume that I was precluded from offering a single amendment.

The proponents of H.R. 20 claim that the bill will restore political rights to Federal employees. It is ironic, however, that in so doing the Democrat leadership and the Rules Committee will prevent 432 Members from offering amendments. Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should be allowed to do so. Each Member was duly elected by their constituents and has the same responsibility to represent them in Congress.

This is not how our forefathers envisioned this deliberative body would legislate. They would be appalled to find that not only is individual thought discouraged, it is punished. Furthermore, they would be disgusted to learn how the legislative process has been perverted by the profligate use of the closed rule.

The Rules Committee is supposed to craft rules that regulate the structure of debate and the amendment process. Instead, it has evolved into an autocratic body that passes on questions of substance rather than procedure. It filters out views and opinions it finds objectionable and decides which questions members are to consider. "The usefulness of an opinion," as John Stuart Mill points out, "is itself a matter of opinion: as disputable, as open to discussion, and requiring discussion as much as the opinion itself."

The Rules Committee is not endowed with greater wisdom than any other Member, and they are not qualified to sit in collective judgment of substantive amendments and speak for the entire body. What is sacrificed through this process is fairness, comity, freedom, and most importantly, the quest for truth.

When freedom of speech and expression are suppressed, opinions are silenced that may certainly be true. John Stuart Mill, in his essay On Liberty points out "this is to assume our own infallibility." No man or woman is infallible, and they have no authority to decide the question for all Members, and to exclude every other person from the means of judging. Mill continued:

> To refuse a hearing to an opinion, because they are sure it is false, is to assume that their certainty is the same thing as absolute certainty. All silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility.

Mr. Speaker, history teaches us that governments are not infallible. Dictatorships and democracies have erred time and again, and will continue to do so. Governments have enslaved entire peoples, engaged in unjust wars, persecuted persons' religion, and levied bad taxes. The occasions that governments are most likely to commit such dreadful mistakes are when objections are not heard, concerns are not debated, and different opinions are suppressed. As Mill commented, "these are exactly the occasions * * * which excite the astonishment and horror of posterity." When the majority assumes its own infallibility, as it is doing by undertaking to decide the question of what amendments can be offered in the House, and sees fit to silence discussion of those views, the quest for truth through free expression is frustrated.

Mr. Speaker, Members should heed the prescient comments of John Stuart Mill who addressed the issue of the liberty of thought and discussion. In On Liberty, John Stuart Mill commented:

> We have now recognized the necessity to the mental well-being of mankind (on which all their other well-being depends) of freedom of opinion, and freedom of the expression of opinion, on four distinct grounds; which we will now briefly recapitulate.
>
> First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.
>
> Secondly, though the silenced opinion be an error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth; and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.
>
> Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth; unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct: the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good, but cumbering the ground, and preventing the growth of any real and heartfelt conviction, from reason or personal experience.

When liberty of thought and discussion is limited, a danger is presented because the majority controls any explanation of dissenting opinion which could be severely misrepresented. The majority could suppress facts or arguments, misstate the elements of the case, and misrepresent the opposite opinion. Open discourse is too precious to be sacrificed to political correctness which limits debates severely.

One must pose the question, Why is the majority afraid of open dialog? It seems that the majority goes to great lengths to restrict debate and discussion because they are concerned that the fallibility of their position or argument will be exposed and free thinking Americans will cast a referendum on those positions. If their arguments be valid and truthful, they should have nothing to fear; however, if they are flawed, the truth, if aired, will prevail. If their positions are the right ones, then the discussion of those ideas will reinforce their wisdom. Ideas that are fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed, will be held to be living truth and not dead dogma. Mill elaborated on this point when he stated:

> Even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth; unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds.

Society can only benefit from such free discussion which provides reinforcement for traditionally held views, or deposes tired only doctrine. As Mill eloquently stated:

> If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error."

Mill points out that even—

> If the silenced opinion be an error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth; and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.

No one can be certain as to the truth of any proposition, and, to restrict open debate and discussion, is to forgo our need to expand and discover the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I pose a question to all Members, Republican and Democrat: Are we, as democratically elected representatives of the citizens of greatest democracy in the world going to choose liberty of thought and discussion or opt for the alternative—gag rule which stifles free and open debate?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker, and I wish to close.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY].

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice deep concern over the rule that is before us. Many of us may agree with the goal of allowing most Federal employees greater opportunity for political participation, but we are concerned that in so doing, under H.R. 20, Congress may also reopen the old paths for political abuse and corruption. As my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has so eloquently stated, these are not partisan concerns. We must preserve the public trust by keeping the governmental services many people count on free from political coercion.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot address these concerns under this restrictive rule that is before us today. For instance, we will not be allowed to address the issue of abuses arising from political

activities of employees of the IRS, the FBI, or the DEA, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the people of this country are demanding change in Congress, today with this rule we are moving forward with the same old business as usual.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART].

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, please excuse me if I reveal insufficient gratitude for the magnanimity of being able to debate three Republican amendments today. The issue, and it is important for the people watching, Mr. Speaker, to know what is going on, I support the legislation that we are going to be voting on today. I see no problem with Federal employees, and they should have, as a matter of fact, not only is there no problem, but Federal employees should have the right to participate in the political process. This reform is long overdue.

The issue is the problem of the closed rule. The issue is that the majority is closing off the rights of the minority to debate, and when the majority is closing off the right of the minority to debate and to present amendments, the constituents of the minority are being discriminated against. It is an elementary violation of the democratic process. I think it is unnecessary and I think, really, it is unacceptable.

That is the issue that we are debating, the rule, the closed rule. The American people have to find out what is happening. They have to put pressure on this body to reject once and for all this impediment to democracy that is so flagrant in this body.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I support this legislation, but the Committee on Rules, and I am talking to my good friend, the Committee on Rules continues to infringe upon the rights of the minority.

Each one of us, and I hope the gentleman will look at me, each one of us represents between 550,000 and 600,000 Americans, and we have the right, I think, or should have the right to at least present our amendments. The Members can vote them down. They have a big majority in this House, and have a big majority in the other House. Why do they stifle debate?

When I was in the Indiana General Assembly I supported this kind of legislation, and I support it today. But why does that side of the aisle stifle debate? They say it is because we do not have the time. They say they have other things to do tomorrow, as was said just a few minutes ago.

The fact of the matter is, we are going to be in town, most of us, tomorrow, and we are not going to have anything to do on the floor. Everybody can see that all Congressmen are not here to participate in debate, so this argument that we do not have the time simply does not hold water.

Rule after rule after rule comes down either gagging the minority or prohibiting us from offering the kind of amendments that we want. I would just like to say the American people want the Members to be fair. The Democrat side has the White House, they have the House of Representatives, they have the Senate. Why in the world would they not allow us at least to offer an amendment? They can vote it down if they want, but be fair.

We each represent a lot of constituents. We would not do it to you, so do not do it to us.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time remains for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the other side has any further requests for speakers?

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker remaining, and I reserve the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] has the right to close.

Mr. GOSS. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, to conclude our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 6 minutes.

□ 1420

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Sanibel, our hard-working new member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, tyranny requires continuous innovation and excuses used to hide the truth. I was fascinated as to the reason used yesterday by which my good friend and classmate, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] was unable to offer his amendment or his group of five amendments that I proposed up in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the reason is that FRANK WOLF does not represent the largest number of Federal employees of any Member of Congress. He used to, as my good friend from St. Louis said, in the past, but he does not any longer, and that seems to be the only reason that FRANK WOLF cannot offer these amendments.

My good friend and the chairman has said also that he had said to someone if we included all of these amendments will you vote for the final passage on this bill, and he said the response that he got was "no." I tried to get my friend from St. Louis to yield me time so that I could respond to that. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that based on what we have heard from our side of the aisle, there is more than a couple of people who like to simply go through the process of allowing their colleagues who represent 600,000 Americans here to have the chance to have their ideas considered, and they may not support those, but they want them to have the right to consider those ideas. And then they still may think it is a very bad bill, even though all those items were brought up and voted on.

So it seems to me as we look at this gag rule once again we are saying to Members that you do not have the right to have your ideas even considered here on the House floor. We want to offer an open rule, to the surprise of my friends on the other side of the aisle. We want to offer an open rule. We want free and fair debate here, and so once again we are going to, believe it or not, have a vote on the previous question.

The previous question is very simple. It says that we will allow an open rule to take place so that all of these amendments, including that of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and the others that tragically were not included, to at least be debated here. I might vote against some of FRANK WOLF's amendments. I am not sure at this point, but I would like to have us have the chance to analyze those. I heard a brief report on them up in the Rules Committee, but I have not heard them fully debated.

As I listened to the argument for the fact that over the last several Congresses we have looked at these issues, that is ludicrous. We have all underscored the fact that one-fourth of this place is comprised of new Members, 63 Democrats and 47 Republicans. During their campaigns, they may have looked at the Hatch Act as an issue, but I doubt that they have gone through the kind of rigorous debate that we would have here on the House floor. And Mr. Speaker, I have been here for a while. I as a Member have not been able to witness the kind of free-flowing debate that we need so that I can thoughtfully consider whether or not I am going to support these different amendments.

What we have done is yes, we have had votes under suspension of the rules in the past on this issue, but we have never had, to my recollection, a full debate on the multifarious amendments that Members on the Democrat side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] included, and the Republican side want to consider. The best way for us to consider those now is to defeat the previous question so that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will have the opportunity to offer his open rule, and we can move ahead with a free-flowing debate.

So I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I move the previous question let me say, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], this bill is almost 20 years old. Wait around another term and it will have reached its majority. To say that this matter has not been debated and debated accurately and at great length over the past 19 years is absurd.

Because of past dilatory tactics, millions of Americans have been denied the right to participate in the political process. Hopefully, after 19 or 20 years, this bill will become law in this session of Congress, and these men and women may enjoy basically the same rights as other Americans.

These heinous acts that are presented to the body about the IRS agents rapping on doors and one thing and another are illegal under the present law, and they will be illegal under the bill H.R. 20 that we will hopefully pass today. And should someone do this he could be prosecuted on the evidence and sentenced to a term of confinement.

As to whether this rule is a fair rule or not, the Rules Committee, as is its custom, listened to many Members who had amendments that they wanted to offer, and in the judgment of a majority of the Rules Committee there were three amendments that should be made in order. The gentleman from New York sought one amendment that he withdrew, but this rule allows three amendments, and allows 30 minutes on each amendment.

It is a fair rule. H.R. 20 is legislation that needs to pass this body, needs to be signed into law.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question, to vote for the rule, and to vote for final passage of this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on the adoption of the resolution without intervening business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 166, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—248

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Orton
Andrews (ME)	Hall (TX)	Owens
Andrews (NJ)	Hamburg	Pallone
Andrews (TX)	Hamilton	Parker
Applegate	Harman	Pastor
Bacchus (FL)	Hastings	Payne (NJ)
Baesler	Hayes	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hefner	Pelosi
Barlow	Hilliard	Penny
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Hoagland	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Hochbrueckner	Pickett
Berman	Holden	Pickle
Bevill	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Bilbray	Hughes	Poshard
Bishop	Hutto	Price (NC)
Blackwell	Inslee	Quillen
Bonior	Jefferson	Rahall
Borski	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Boucher	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Brewster	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Brooks	Johnston	Richardson
Browder	Kanjorski	Rose
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Rowland
Brown (FL)	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kennelly	Rush
Byrne	Kildee	Sabo
Cantwell	Kleczka	Sanders
Cardin	Klein	Sangmeister
Carr	Klink	Sarpalius
Chapman	Kopetski	Sawyer
Clay	Kreidler	Schenk
Clement	LaFalce	Schroeder
Clyburn	Lambert	Schumer
Coleman	Lancaster	Scott
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Serrano
Collins (MI)	LaRocco	Sharp
Condit	Laughlin	Shepherd
Conyers	Lehman	Sisisky
Cooper	Levin	Skaggs
Coppersmith	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Costello	Lipinski	Slattery
Coyne	Lloyd	Slaughter
Cramer	Long	Smith (IA)
Danner	Lowey	Spratt
Darden	Maloney	Stark
de la Garza	Mann	Stenholm
Deal	Manton	Stokes
DeFazio	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Strickland
DeLauro	Markey	Studds
Dellums	Martinez	Stupak
Derrick	Matsui	Sundquist
Deutsch	Mazzoli	Swett
Dicks	McCloskey	Swift
Dingell	McCurdy	Synar
Dixon	McDermott	Tanner
Dooley	McHale	Taylor (MS)
Durbin	McKinney	Tejeda
Edwards (CA)	McNulty	Thornton
Edwards (TX)	Meehan	Thurman
Engel	Meek	Torres
English (AZ)	Menendez	Torricelli
English (OK)	Mfume	Towns
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Traficant
Fazio	Mineta	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Minge	Unsoeld
Filner	Mink	Velazquez
Fingerhut	Moakley	Vento
Flake	Mollohan	Visclosky
Foglietta	Montgomery	Volkmer
Ford (MI)	Moran	Waters
Frank (MA)	Morella	Watt
Frost	Murphy	Waxman
Furse	Murtha	Wheat
Gejdenson	Nadler	Whitten
Gephardt	Natcher	Williams
Geren	Neal (MA)	Wilson
Gibbons	Neal (NC)	Wise
Glickman	Oberstar	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Obey	Wyden
Gordon	Olver	Wynn
Green		Yates

NAYS—166

Allard	Barrett (NE)	Bliley
Archer	Bartlett	Blute
Armey	Barton	Boehlert
Bachus (AL)	Bateman	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Bentley	Bonilla
Baker (LA)	Bereuter	Bunning
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Burton
Buyer	Hoekstra	Paxon
Callahan	Hoke	Petri
Calvert	Horn	Pombo
Camp	Houghton	Porter
Canady	Huffington	Pryce (OH)
Castle	Hunter	Quinn
Clinger	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Coble	Hyde	Ravenel
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Regula
Combest	Inhofe	Ridge
Crane	Istook	Roberts
Crapo	Jacobs	Rogers
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Roth
Dickey	Kim	Royce
Doolittle	King	Santorum
Dornan	Kingston	Saxton
Dreier	Klug	Schaefer
Duncan	Knollenberg	Schiff
Dunn	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Kyl	Shaw
Everett	Lazio	Shays
Ewing	Leach	Shuster
Fawell	Levy	Skeen
Fish	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Fowler	Lewis (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Franks (CT)	Lightfoot	Smith (OR)
Franks (NJ)	Linder	Smith (TX)
Gallegly	Livingston	Snowe
Gallo	Machtley	Solomon
Gekas	Manzullo	Spence
Gilchrest	McCandless	Stearns
Gillmor	McCollum	Stump
Gilman	McCrery	Talent
Gingrich	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Goodlatte	McInnis	Thomas (CA)
Goodling	McKeon	Thomas (WY)
Goss	McMillan	Torkildsen
Grams	Meyers	Upton
Grandy	Mica	Vucanovich
Greenwood	Michel	Walker
Gunderson	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Hancock	Molinari	Weldon
Hansen	Moorhead	Wolf
Hastert	Myers	Zeliff
Hefley	Nussle	Zimmer
Herger	Oxley	
Hobson	Packard	

NOT VOTING—16

Bryant	Henry	Valentine
Clayton	McDade	Washington
Cox	Roemer	Young (AK)
Evans	Rostenkowski	Young (FL)
Fields (TX)	Roukema	
Ford (TN)	Tauzin	

□ 1448

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Clayton for, with Mrs. Roukema against.

Messrs. JACOBS, RIDGE, and KASICH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. OBERSTAR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 163, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

AYES—249

Abercrombie	Harman	Parker
Ackerman	Hastings	Pastor
Andrews (ME)	Hayes	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (NJ)	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Andrews (TX)	Hilliard	Pelosi
Applegate	Hinchey	Penny
Bacchus (FL)	Hoagland	Peterson (FL)
Baesler	Hochbrueckner	Peterson (MN)
Barcia	Holden	Pickett
Barlow	Hoyer	Pickle
Barrett (WI)	Hughes	Pomeroy
Becerra	Hutto	Poshard
Berman	Inslee	Price (NC)
Bevill	Jacobs	Quillen
Bilbray	Jefferson	Rahall
Bishop	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Blackwell	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Bonior	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Borski	Johnston	Richardson
Boucher	Kanjorski	Ridge
Brewster	Kaptur	Rose
Brooks	Kennedy	Rowland
Browder	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Brown (CA)	Kildee	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kleczka	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Klein	Sanders
Byrne	Klink	Sangmeister
Cantwell	Kopetski	Sarpalius
Cardin	Kreidler	Sawyer
Carr	LaFalce	Schenk
Chapman	Lambert	Schroeder
Clay	Lancaster	Schumer
Clement	Lantos	Scott
Clyburn	LaRocco	Serrano
Coleman	Laughlin	Shays
Collins (IL)	Lehman	Shepherd
Collins (MI)	Levin	Sisisky
Condit	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Cooper	Lipinski	Skelton
Coppersmith	Lloyd	Slattery
Costello	Long	Slaughter
Coyne	Lowey	Smith (IA)
Cramer	Machtley	Spratt
Danner	Maloney	Stark
Darden	Mann	Stenholm
de la Garza	Manton	Stokes
Deal	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Strickland
DeFazio	Markey	Studds
DeLauro	Martinez	Stupak
Dellums	Matsui	Sundquist
Derrick	Mazzoli	Swett
Deutsch	McCloskey	Swift
Dicks	McCurdy	Synar
Dingell	McDermott	Tanner
Dixon	McHale	Tauzin
Dooley	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Durbin	McNulty	Tejeda
Edwards (CA)	Meehan	Thornton
Engel	Meek	Thurman
English (AZ)	Menendez	Torres
English (OK)	Mfume	Torricelli
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Towns
Fazio	Mineta	Traficant
Fields (LA)	Minge	Tucker
Filner	Mink	Unsoeld
Fingerhut	Moakley	Velazquez
Flake	Mollohan	Vento
Ford (MI)	Montgomery	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Moran	Volkmer
Frost	Morella	Washington
Furse	Murphy	Waters
Gejdenson	Murtha	Watt
Gephardt	Nadler	Waxman
Geren	Natcher	Wheat
Gibbons	Neal (MA)	Whitten
Glickman	Neal (NC)	Williams
Gonzalez	Oberstar	Wilson
Gordon	Obey	Wise
Green	Olver	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Ortiz	Wyden
Hall (OH)	Orton	Wynn
Hall (TX)	Owens	Yates
Hamburg	Pallone	
Hamilton		

NOES—163

Allard	Ballenger	Bentley
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Bereuter
Armey	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Bachus (AL)	Barton	Bliley
Baker (CA)	Bateman	Blute
Baker (LA)	Beilenson	Boehlert
Boehner	Hansen	Nussle
Bonilla	Hastert	Oxley
Bunning	Hefley	Packard
Burton	Herger	Paxon
Buyer	Hobson	Petri
Callahan	Hoekstra	Pombo
Calvert	Hoke	Porter
Camp	Horn	Pryce (OH)
Canady	Houghton	Quinn
Castle	Huffington	Ramstad
Clinger	Hunter	Ravenel
Coble	Hutchinson	Regula
Collins (GA)	Hyde	Roberts
Combest	Inglis	Rogers
Crane	Inhofe	Rohrabacher
Crapo	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Roth
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Santorum
Dickey	Kim	Saxton
Doolittle	King	Schaefer
Dornan	Kingston	Schiff
Dreier	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Knollenberg	Shaw
Dunn	Kolbe	Shuster
Emerson	Kyl	Skeen
Everett	Lazio	Smith (MI)
Ewing	Leach	Smith (NJ)
Fawell	Levy	Smith (OR)
Fish	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Foglietta	Lewis (FL)	Snowe
Fowler	Lightfoot	Solomon
Franks (CT)	Linder	Spence
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Stearns
Gallegly	Manzullo	Stump
Gallo	McCandless	Talent
Gekas	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Gilchrest	McCrery	Thomas (WY)
Gillmor	McHugh	Torkildsen
Gilman	McInnis	Upton
Gingrich	McKeon	Vucanovich
Goodlatte	McMillan	Walker
Goodling	Meyers	Walsh
Goss	Mica	Weldon
Grams	Michel	Wolf
Grandy	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Greenwood	Molinari	Zimmer
Gunderson	Moorhead	
Hancock	Myers	

NOT VOTING—18

Bryant	Fields (TX)	Roukema
Clayton	Ford (TN)	Sharp
Conyers	Henry	Taylor (NC)
Cox	McDade	Valentine
Edwards (TX)	Roemer	Young (AK)
Evans	Rostenkowski	Young (FL)

□ 1458

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Clayton for, with Mrs. Roukema against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I regret missing the vote on the rule for H.R. 20. I was unavoidably detained in a meeting on the Senate side of the Capitol. Had I been present, I would have voted against the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 106 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 20.

□ 1459

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 20) to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes, with Mr. TORRES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

□ 1500

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, denying any citizen the right to free and full participation in the political process is a contradiction in a democratic government. This is what the Hatch Act has done to millions of Federal employees for more than half a century. H.R. 20, the Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1993, restores the most basic aspect of the rights the first amendment was intended to protect to more than 3 million Federal and postal workers.

The legislation we are considering today has a long history. I first introduced legislation to reform the Hatch Act in 1974. On four separate occasions, the House of Representatives has passed legislation to significantly remove the restrictions on the basic rights of Americans. The legislation we are considering today is virtually identical to the bipartisan compromise developed by the former ranking Republican on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Honorable GENE TAYLOR, and myself in 1987. This legislation passed the House of Representatives in the 100th Congress by a vote of 305 to 112, and passed the House of Representatives again in the 101st Congress by a vote 297 to 90.

H.R. 20 embodies a very simple principle. No Federal employee should be able to use his or her office to intimidate or interfere in the ability of any other citizen to freely exercise the right to vote. This legislation contains strict prohibitions, reinforced by criminal sanctions, to preclude any Federal employee from unduly or improperly interfering with any other citizen's right to vote. H.R. 20 prohibits Federal employees from engaging in any form of political activity while on duty, in a Federal facility, in their uniform, or while using any vehicle owned or leased by the Government. This prohibition applies to employees of the executive branch, the competitive service, and the postal service excepting

only the President, the Vice President, and certain high-level political appointees.

Under this legislation, Federal and postal employees cannot use official authority or influence to interfere with the result of any election and may not use official information for any political purpose, unless that information is otherwise available to the public. To ensure that these restrictions have meaning, Federal and postal employees may not knowingly solicit, accept, or receive a contribution from any person who does business with or is regulated by the employee's agency, or has interests that may be affected by the performance of the employee's duties. Nor may any Federal employee solicit or receive a political contribution from a subordinate or offer or provide a political contribution to a supervisor. Among other sanctions, employees who violate these provisions may be barred from employment in the Federal Government.

While this legislation tightens protection to ensure that those who hold official office do not abuse that office, it also removes existing restrictions on the ability of Federal employees, when acting on their own time as private citizens, to engage in partisan political activity. If there ever was any justification for limiting the basic first amendment rights of Federal workers, that justification has long since ceased to exist. Since this legislation was enacted in 1939, we have substantially reformed the civil service system. Federal employees no longer serve at the whim of their immediate supervisor. An extensive system of law and regulation, including independent and judicial review, now exists to ensure that employment decisions within the Government are based upon competence rather than patronage.

The extension of the franchise is among the finest chapters in American history. Originally limited to white, male property holders, now every citizen, with the glaring exception of one class of American citizens, has a right to organize with like minded citizens and to attempt to persuade other Americans of the wisdom of their views regarding the political future of the Nation. The Hatch Act is one of the most ignoble laws ever enacted by the Congress. It denies 3 million American citizens the right to choose in political activity on behalf of partisan candidates. In essence, their rights are limited to the hollow act of choosing among candidates selected for them by others. Their circumstances are identical to those of average citizens in the old Soviet Union who also had the right to vote, but only among candidates chosen for them.

Political freedom encompasses much more. It is the right to host political events in your own home for your friends and neighbors. It is the right to distribute leaflets and brochures on behalf of causes and candidates you feel are important. It is the right to stuff envelopes, work a telephone bank, and drive voters to the polls. It is the right to speak and vote at local, regional, State, and national caucuses and conventions. In short, it is the right to organize with like-minded people for the purpose of persuading others of the soundness and importance of your own political views. That is the essence of democracy. It is the substantive meaning of the right of free speech, the right to assemble, and the right to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

Today, there are over 3,000 separate regulatory rulings interpreting and enforcing the Hatch Act. In the face of this regulatory morass, Federal and postal workers have little idea as to just what constitutes unlawful political activity under the Hatch Act. To the extent that the law serves any end at all today, it serves to intimidate and discourage Federal and postal employees from engaging in any political activity. Regrettably, both Democratic and Republican administrations have sought to use the law to muzzle perceived opponents.

While the Hatch Act has served as an irresistible temptation by which an administration may intimidate and coerce 3 million Federal and postal employees, it has proven to be impotent in accomplishing the purpose for which it was enacted—deterring those who would abuse their official positions in order to retain power. H.R. 20 ensures that Federal and postal employees, as well as the public, shall be able to freely choose, without fear of intimidation, whether they wish to participate in the politics of their country, be it local, State, or national. It better protects Federal and postal employees from coercion and intimidation intended to force political involvement, the kind of abuse the Hatch Act sought to redress. It also frees Federal and postal employees to engage in otherwise lawful political activity on their own time, and thus ends the coercive gag imposed upon them by the Hatch Act today.

Free speech and the right to exercise a meaningful voice in the selection of one's Government are the foundation of our Republic. These rights are no less important to Federal and postal employees than they are to women, blacks, or any other group of American citizens. I am confident that this Congress will provide Federal and postal workers with the full political rights to which they are entitled. I urge you to vote for H.R. 20.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I congratulate my chairman for bringing this bill to the floor, even though I do disagree with the procedure that it is coming to the floor under. I would have spoken against the rule, this modified rule, whatever you want to call it, if I had been given the chance. But, because of confusion, I did not have the chance to speak at that time, so I am going to speak very briefly about the rule.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, deserving of standing on its own. It did not need to have a closed rule, and I do not think there is any question we would have easily defeated every amendment that was going to be offered.

It is a tragedy that a good bill like this be tainted by the procedure here. I know on the Republican side there are going to be some Members who vote against this because of the procedure, and I am sorry to see them vote against something that is good legislation. They assured me, given the opportunity, they might have voted for some of the amendments.

But this bill passed through a week ago, lacking only three votes of having the necessary two-thirds under the suspension of the rules. I can recall back in high school, 50 years ago, studying about the various branches of Government in a high school civics class. This, the House of Representatives, was called the People's House.

What has happened to the People's House today? You, the elected officials, the elected Representatives of the people, are denied the right to offer an amendment if you want to, and I do not think it is necessary. I never have supported a closed rule, with the exception of tax laws around here. Tax laws have to be closed rules, I think, because none of us really know enough about tax legislation to really write legislation. So we have to depend upon people of expertise.

But we all understand that we are trying to free here people who have been held down for so many years and not given an opportunity to participate in the political system that all of us take for granted.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and I have been friends for a long time. The gentleman spoke about freeing up the people to do what is right politically. Why did the gentleman not vote today to free up the Members of Congress to have the same political freedom? That is all I was begging for. I would have voted against the amendments. The gentleman and I agreed to this. But I just think it is wrong to deny us this. I hate to pursue this any further, but this is the people's body. I love this place, I love the institution, but it is tragic again this year that of the five bills we have had, every one of them has been a modified rule.

The argument can be made, rightfully so, that under the rules of the House technically this was not a closed

rule. But is sure was not open either, was it? So in my old Indiana vernacular here, if it is not open, by gosh, it has to be closed.

Mr. Chairman, I think we made a big mistake. I think this will pass and become law, but it is too bad it will have that stain.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of arguments in the media and outside of the media. Most of those arguments have been by those who do not understand what is in the legislation. I think it protests the rights of civil service employees and postal employees to be protected from a supervisor who might use them for political gain, for political purposes. But it also frees employees up who work for the civil service or Postal Service. They can run for political office after taking a leave of absence. I think this is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is one suggestion by a local newspaper of an IRS agent who is auditing an individual, and during that audit comes out and says, "By the way, taxpayer, I have a friend running for office. Would you put this sign in your yard?"

Subchapter 3, article 7323, of this bill, entitled "Use of Official Influence or Official Information; Prohibition," it says an employee may not, directly or indirectly, use or attempt to use the official authority or influence of the employee for the purpose of interfering with, and it goes on, intimidating, the word used, threatening, coercing, commanding, influencing, or attempting to intimidate, threaten, coerce, command, or influence. Criminal sanctions prohibiting such action are there.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have everything built in here to protect the right of the civil service employee against being coerced or being forced by anyone to do something he did not wish to, but also it frees him up to participate in a service. It is something that should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and I have been cosponsors of this for a good many years. It has twice passed in this House. Once it got to the President. George Bush is a friend of mine. I tried to prevail upon him last year. I thought he made a mistake. He told us he made a campaign promise that he would not support this legislation. I wish he would have kept all of his campaign promises though, "Read my lips." I think he kicks himself now, too, for maybe keeping the wrong ones.

But, nevertheless, I think this is good legislation. I hope that even those who differ with the procedure, and I quite agree, it is a wrong procedure, will support this very badly needed legislation, this good legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL].

□ 1510

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, there are no restrictions on the ability of Members of Congress to fully participate in the political process. In addition, there are no restrictions on the ability of staff of the Congress to fully participate in the political process.

Why then do we continue to restrict other Federal employees from fully participating in the political process? The reason is that the Congress has simply resisted change.

In the House of Representatives, we have passed Hatch Act reform legislation on four separate occasions over the last 20 years. We have done our part in the past, we should continue to do our job and pass H.R. 20 today.

Most Federal employees now operate under a strict merit personnel system. The days of the spoils system are gone. We need no longer fear coercion and intimidation as a tool to interfere with the results of elections. More importantly, this bill retains strict prohibitions on political activity while on the job.

Federal employees may not engage in political activity while working, while in Federal buildings, while in uniform, or while using Government vehicles. In addition, it prohibits the use of official information for political purposes, prohibits contributions to a superior, and prohibits solicitation of political contributions from any person who has a contractual relationship with an employee's agency.

Mr. Chairman, 41 States have already done what we propose to do here today. This bill simply does what the Constitution of the United States requires. It treats all persons equally.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a very valued member of this committee and a very senior member.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 20, the Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1993, otherwise known as the Hatch Act reform bill.

Regretably, last week, because of the procedural objection to considering this measure on the Suspension Calendar, the House failed to approve this Hatch Act reform measure. This procedural problem caused an unfortunate setback for our Federal employees who have waited years, 54 years to be exact, to regain the right to fully participate in our political system.

However, that undue, prolonged delay is about to end, and I urge my colleagues to vote their hearts on this issue. Now that we have considered the procedural objections, let us lift the Hatch restrictions on Federal employees.

Under the provisions of H.R. 20, Federal employees will continue to carry out their official responsibilities with impartiality, while having the ability to exercise their political rights on their own time. The measure we are considering today contains both penalties for coercion and protections for employees. Additionally, a factor not present half a century ago but available today is the broad application of the merit system, which protects over three-quarters of Federal workers and guarantees open competition and merit-based promotion.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and allow 4 million Americans to fully exercise their political rights.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Federal Employees Political Activities Act, H.R. 20.

This stands for the principles that are as basic as the foundations of our democracy. They reach down deep, as far back as the Boston Tea Party and the American Revolution. These principles are as basic as the 13th amendment, the 15th amendment, the 19th amendment, giving women the right to vote, the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Inclusion is the name of this game.

H.R. 20 stands for inclusion in our political process; inclusion in our democracy.

I submit to my colleagues that none of us in this democracy is free until all of us are free. None of us is fully empowered politically until all of us are fully empowered politically. And for 3 million people in these United States to be without the right of full political participation is to deny freedom to all of us.

So I submit to my colleagues that H.R. 20 is a resolution, is a law whose time has come.

It has safeguards. It provides for penalties, both civil and criminal, in the event of improprieties. But most importantly, it provides for justice, political justice for the 3 million Federal employees in this country who are now denied the right to participate fully in our electoral process.

I urge this House to please adopt H.R. 20. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] is recognized for 2 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 20.

I do not relish the thought of opposing this important bill. I commend Chairman CLAY for his efforts to re-

form this outdated legislation. And I am pleased that our President supports the rights of our Federal workers.

I strongly support the right of the American worker to participate in our democracy and the democratic proceeds.

There is no reason why a welder in the Philadelphia Navy Yard, or a postal worker, or virtually any Federal worker should be denied the basic American right to participate in our political process.

However, I believe this bill will create opportunities for abuse. I am concerned that officials involved in law enforcement, tax audits, and immigration investigations would, simply through the authority of their position, exert pressure on votes and, yes intimidate them.

This group makes up a very small percentage—less than 3 percent—of the Federal work force.

But, I am from Philadelphia—these types of political pressure are not abstract concepts for me.

I am reminded of a scene that illustrates my concern.

Several years ago, I saw a group of police officers streaming out of their police stations wearing political buttons on their lapels and straw hats with banners. These men were off duty. But the threat was there for anyone who saw them: Be for their candidate or incur the wrath of your neighborhood policemen.

Imagine the power of an IRS or F.B.I. agent who comes to your door asking that you vote for or against a particular candidate.

Imagine the power of an INS agent as he or she campaigns in a certain neighborhood.

Yesterday, I asked the Rules Committee to accept my amendment which would exempt these types of workers from this bill. It was denied that opportunity. I support the rights of the Federal workers. But, in good conscience, I cannot support H.R. 20.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us should have passed the House last week. Unfortunately, it didn't. But due to the tenacity of the bill's sponsor—who happens to be our committee chairman—we have another chance today.

I understand the concerns of those who oppose H.R. 20. But I believe those concerns are unfounded. The Hatch Act is in need of reform. It is outdated. It is time to give Federal and postal employees the freedom to exercise their political rights away from the workplace.

There's talk on the floor today that passage of this legislation would lead to political coercion of career civil servants by their superiors. That is not right. H.R. 20 imposes stronger restrictions on the abuse of official authority than current law. There have been suggestions that career employees could use their governmental positions to intimidate citizens for political purpose. That is against the law today and will be tomorrow if this bill becomes law.

Under the Hatch Act, Government workers are treated like second-class citizens. They are denied their constitutional rights. That is not right.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this much needed legislation.

□ 1520

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], a very valued senior member of this committee.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Hatch Act is an anachronism that needs to be reformed. Since 1940, it has become an accumulation of over 3,000 regulations that are contradictory, ambiguous, and indeed, confusing, that have deprived 3 million Federal employees from having a voice in Government.

Currently on the job with the the Hatch Act one can wear a button advocating a candidate for office, but one cannot, in one's own time, host a meet-the-candidate coffee in one's neighborhood, at one's home. Nobody knows what these regulations mean, what the effect is; but what a loss, what a loss.

Scientists from the National Institutes of Health, statisticians from the Census Bureau, inspectors from the Department of Agriculture, and it goes on and on, all of these people are deprived of the opportunity to be involved in their own time in their government.

Currently, the secretary of a department, a Cabinet Secretary, can go off and can host a big fundraiser for a candidate for office, whereas a clerical secretary in that very department is deprived of the opportunity to address envelopes at night, in his or her own home, for a candidate running for the county council. That is wrong. It is finally time for us to change it.

This bill, bipartisan, carefully crafted after all these years, gives our Federal employees the right to be involved and the freedom to not be involved, with all these safeguards. Forty States allow their public employees to be involved and there have been no problems.

Mr. Chairman, our Constitution starts off, "We the people," and not, "We the people, except for Federal employees." Let us pass the reform of the Hatch Act.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Chairman, I would commend the chairman for his work on this piece of legislation. If we look out the back yard of this Capitol, we will see a large mall and in the middle of that mall is the Washington Monument, then the Lincoln Memorial, and across the Potomac River is a hill. On that hill lies the remains of thousands of young men and women who shed their blood on the ground, so that we can enjoy the freedom that this country represents.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this bill is about today. It is about reinstating a certain class of freedom to a certain class of people; 4 million people who have been denied the right to participate in the political process in this country.

This bill is that piece of legislation that reinstates that freedom. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this legislation and to support the Hatch Act.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, first we need to see that this is not a bill for the Federal employees, this is a bill to take from the Federal employees.

I come from a district in which the political abuse is so outlined, that when I first ran for the State House of Representatives, the day that I filed, the newspapers covered a report where teachers, and these were State employees at the time, because the chairman of one party picked the school board and the school board then took care of political contributions, the report pointed out that these public employees not only had to vote right and had to contribute right, but they had to buy their groceries and their cars from the right people.

Mr. Chairman, it took us years to reform that inside the State of North Carolina, to get elected school boards, to get the people in the process, and to get the public employees of that area, off limits to political partisanship that wanted to take from and abuse those employees.

If this bill is passed then we are going to see the Federal employees but put in the same position where unscrupulous political leaders, getting inside the system, will use this as a cash cow to promote politicians.

In 1939, because of the abuses in the U.S. senatorial race, this Congress and the administration of Franklin Roosevelt then saw a threat so great that they passed the original Hatch Act. We are getting ready today to change that.

Mr. Chairman, I am voting "no," and I hope the rest of this Congress will.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the committee and the sponsors of H.R. 20 for allowing me time to address the House.

Mr. Chairman, how important H.R. 20 is, we are not talking about groceries or automobiles, we are talking about people's rights. If somebody is forcing their employees to buy their groceries or buy their cars at a certain location, then I think they need to go down to the local district attorney's office and talk to that person, because that is how we take care of that in Texas.

In Texas, our State employees have these rights. We have restored these rights, including law enforcement personnel, 4 years ago, and have had no problems since then. Let me relate the reason that I am here today and a cosponsor of H.R. 20.

I know of a 37-year-old letter carrier who for many years did not have the opportunity to get involved in his elections. He voted like a good citizen would, but that letter carrier wanted to be involved, but he could not because he was worried about losing his job. That letter carrier never did anything but go vote, and I think today it is so important that we pass this and restore that right for that letter carrier, along with all Federal employees.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I will try to be brief on my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken a pretty active role on this bill, both today and last week and in previous years. When people back home, including in my office, think of FRED UPTON, they think about deficit reduction, they think about what he is doing for southwestern Michigan, and all the many things that I have tried to accomplish during, now, my fourth term.

I do not have a lot of Federal employees. This does not have a lot to do with reducing the deficit, but what I have tried to think about in my role on this bill, and what has driven me to take the role that I have, is that I was once Hatched. I know what it feels like to be a Government employee that is Hatched, and you cannot do anything when you go home. I think that is terribly unfair.

I believe in freedom and democracy. I can visualize the other countries of the world, whether they be Poland or Central America or other places, that look to our great country as one that stands for freedom and democracy, except, of course, our Federal workers.

This is not a repeal of the Hatch Act that was envisioned back in 1939 or so. This is reform. This has tough penalties. They are increased over the present law for those that campaign. They cannot coerce other folks to get involved in campaigns. That is wrong, and there are tough penalties to make sure that that does not happen.

Off-hours, when that employee goes home, as I did when I was Hatched, that employee ought to have the same right as their neighbor or any other non-Federal employee to participate in the events that they would like to, as any other American.

□ 1530

We all have children. Can you imagine telling the Federal worker who is "Hatched" today that either they or their spouse, because they work for the Federal Government, cannot have a role in looking for someone running for a partisan office like a school board, or a township clerk or trustee? You cannot put up yard signs on a Saturday, you cannot circulate petitions, even if your spouse is running for office. That is wrong, and we need to get with the rest of the other workers across this land to make that change.

The point has been made here today and in previous debates that Federal employees are against this Hatch Act reform, they do not want to be involved. That was not the case for FRED UPTON when I was Hatched, and I can tell Members and cite for them a whole laundry list of the names of folks that worked as I did for the Reagan administration. I can cite name and verse of a number of folks that worked their tails off for President Reagan as a political appointee.

And when President Bush was elected, and they were off course as political appointees are, they are asked to resign, and many of them then were asked to carry on under the new administration, the first question was, "What did you do to help President Bush?" Well, "I could not do anything. I was Hatched." "Well, I'm sorry, you don't have another job." That's wrong. And in your off-hours you ought to be able to do what you want, and that is what this bill does.

The bill was not perfect. I voted against the rule because we were not able to offer an open rule. But I thank the Rules Committee for making an amendment in order that I will later offer with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], to make sure that the Federal Election Commission employees stay under the old law. And I thank the Rules Committee for allowing that amendment.

But we need this. It is long overdue, and we ought to give a message to our Federal employees that they are wanted in the process.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia [Ms. BYRNE], a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said on this bill about political intimidation and threats to Federal employees. But I would like to tell Members a story about a young man last year who was called into a Federal agency and sat down by the special counsel and told, "Young man, if I see you with a picture of your parent who is running for office, we are going to have to remove you from your job."

It was an outright threat and intimidation that was allowed under the old Hatch Act, what we are trying to get rid of right here. And I know this story pretty well, because that young man was my son. And the fact is if there is any political intimidation going on right now, it is under the old rules. It is saying do not dare go out and participate because we will stomp on you; we will get you.

And in terms of ordinary citizens being afraid of Federal employees using their political franchise, I would remind the opponents of this bill that it was not the IRS agents, the grade 9's who made the Nixon hit list for audits. It was political appointees who made the Nixon hit list for audits.

It was not the civil servants who went through the State Department files of the current President. It was not the civil servants; it was the political appointees. And if there is any political intimidation going on now, it is by those people in every single agency that are political appointees, not the Federal civil servants and post office workers.

That is why this bill is so sorely needed. We need to have equity in this system and allow Federal employees to have their franchise back.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to compliment the gentlewoman from Virginia for her remarks.

Most of the citations that have been made by the media and others about the potential violations, the abuse by civil service employees or postal employees, anyone working for the Federal Government, can exist today under the existing law. They are wrong. They would be in violation and subject to criminal penalties, but they could happen today under the existing law.

What we are trying to do here is to provide legally and restrict just how far those individuals can go by giving permission to work within the system and to exercise their rights that most of us take for granted. So I compliment the gentlewoman for her comments. She is exactly right. Just about everything I have seen as criticism as to why we should not vote for this legislation could exist today and probably does in some instances. But it is wrong, both morally as well as criminally.

So I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. COYNE].

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 20, the Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1993.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is long overdue. The bill simply states that Federal employees should be permitted to exercise rights that all our citizens

have, and that is to participate in the political process of our country.

H.R. 20 permits employees of the executive branch to engage in political activity and to exercise their political rights.

The legislation would allow Federal workers to run for office and to manage campaigns, to cite but two examples of increased participation in the political process.

This bill has a list of prohibited activities and forbids Federal employees from in any way using their Federal position to influence the electoral process.

Mr. Chairman, Federal workers should be allowed their rights as citizens.

Their professionalism and the legislation itself will prevent them from abusing the exercise of these rights.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], very much for bringing up this most important piece of legislation.

I will tell you what this is all about. It is about first amendment rights. There is nothing else involved here. That is it.

In my neighborhood, in my district in Coshocton, OH, the Ku Klux Klan has been given a permit to march because the courts have said so. The Nazis in Illinois in a Jewish neighborhood were given a permit to march because the courts said they had that right. People in this country are allowed to burn the U.S. flag because the courts have said that is a right. And yet, Federal workers are not allowed to work on campaigns. They cannot become involved in the political situation. But Congress cannot deny all of these other things by law because the courts have said this.

But hardworking Americans, American Federal employees, good Americans who participate in their communities, are denied first amendment rights. This is preposterous. They have been made second-class citizens.

And I will say if it is so bad, if it is so bad that there is fear of coercion or because of political pressure, then why does everybody want it? It does not make sense. If somebody was going to pressure me, I would want to keep them out of my life. But Federal employees want it.

□ 1540

I think that is America's shame to deny part of our citizenry the right to the first amendment.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member on Post Office, I want to say how honored I am to be here with committee members on both sides, and it was especially nice to have the gentleman from Michigan, one of the younger members, to get up and talk about how important the Hatch Act is.

The rest of us have been out on this floor so many times on this issue that we begin to feel like broken records.

I must say that when I first got out of law school and began to work for the NLRB, I was horrified to find out I could not participate in anything that looked to me like normal civic duty, the things that I thought we were supposed to be into, and we had crazy people even out measuring bumper stickers on people's bumpers to make sure they were not too big, and they had silly little things about how big signs could be and whether or not you could hammer them in, and could you go to your caucus and could you go to your convention. I mean, it was absolutely nuts. People were totally intimidated by this. Supervisors used it as a big club over your head.

When I chaired the subcommittee, this came out, and I know the gentleman from Missouri has reported this out when he was the subcommittee chair, and he is now the full committee chair. We have had this on the floor over and over and over again. We keep wondering what is the issue; why is this country so afraid to allow Federal employees constitutional rights to participate in the electoral system. You would think it would be something that there would be a huge mandate for.

Actually, this has been on this floor over and over again. We have gotten very strong votes for it, but unfortunately it keeps getting vetoed and vetoed and vetoed. This time it looks like it might really, really be signed.

I think to allow the people who know so much about this Government and how it works, and they could be the ultimate political whistleblowers if they wanted to be, and they have all sorts of protections against supervisors coming down on their heads and doing anything else, so I think this is a very good day, and that this bill might finally become the law, and Federal employees might finally become full-class citizens.

I think that is good news for everybody after over 200 years of this Republic. I thank very much the gentleman from Missouri for his leadership on this.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine any Hatch Act being able to stop the gentlewoman from Colorado from speaking. It went a lot further than I realized it could.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], a valued member of this committee.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 20. One founding principle of this country was that all citizens should have the right to freedom of speech. However, because of an antiquated law passed in 1939, the nearly 4 million postal and Federal employees do not currently have the freedom to express their opinions on who should govern them.

Can we really say that nothing has changed since 1939? Technology has changed; and yes, even the civil service has changed. Our Government and postal employees have proven themselves worthy of our trust and respect. The 1939 law is clearly excessive, clearly intrusive, not to mention outdated. Postal and Federal workers currently must comply with more than 3,000 separate regulatory ruling about political activity on and off the job.

Federal and postal workers cannot host a reception after hours in their home for a political candidate. Federal and postal workers may attend a political rally, but they are forbidden to carry a sign. Federal and postal employees may write letters to the editor, but not more than five. Bumper stickers and yard signs must comply with size restrictions. These restrictions are clearly excessive and limit the constitutional rights of those who are employed by our own Government.

Under the Hatch Act reform we are considering today, it would still be illegal to do political work on the Federal Government's time. It would still be illegal to force or coerce a Federal or postal employee into political work or to discriminate against those who refrain from political involvement. The bill does protect the rights of those who choose to remain uninvolved. Anyone who misuses official authority or Federal information could be fined, jailed, or fired.

We all know Federal and postal workers, and I think it is only fair to say that they have been diligent in their efforts to comply with the letter and the spirit of the Hatch Act. We can expect the same response from them if this reform measure is enacted.

There has been a great deal of speculation that public employees' unions are out to control the government. However, Federal and postal workers are not sheep who may be led around by some imaginary big brother. They are individuals. They are patriotic and articulate citizens who are knowledgeable about many aspects of the United States Government. They deserve a political voice equal to that of all other Americans, and I, for one, would like to hear what they have to say.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to restore to public servants

the right of free association and the right to exercise their basic first amendment rights by supporting H.R. 20.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, Federal employees are among the most dedicated and hard-working members of the American work force. They care a great deal about helping to shape public policy. To that end, they should be allowed to actively participate in the political process. In fact, the right to assemble and participate in the affairs of government is a constitutional right. This body cannot use the arguments of the 1930's to make a valid case for the Hatch Act in the 1990's. When the act was passed, less than 32 percent of the Federal work force was covered by a classified merit system. Today, almost 80 percent of Federal employees are covered by a system that protects them from political influence and abuse. We are the only democratic nation that prohibits its Federal workers from participating in the political process. Keep in mind, employees must not engage in political activity while on the job, and they can not use any official information for political purposes, unless that information is available to the public. At a time when we are asking our Federal workers to bear the double burden of a possible tax hike and a pay freeze, we ought not to continue to prohibit them the right to participate in our democratic process. I urge you to support H.R. 20.

We can only have a democracy if we afford those individuals who work in the work force as Federal employees to fully participate by being able to not only voice their vote in the voting booth but have the opportunity to also participate in political activities at their homes and at other places across America.

The purpose of this is not to start any political maneuver with appointees of the Government but to give individuals an opportunity to fully exercise their constitutional right.

I ask the Members of this body, please, support H.R. 20, because it is in the best interest of America and certainly in the best interests of the American workers. At this time, speaking of the workers, they have a double burden, once where we are going to be asking in the very near future these Federal employees to pay a tax hike, and we also will be asking them to take a freeze in their pay, a double burden by the taxpayers on the Federal employees of this country. I ask you to pass this act, because it is in the best interests of the Federal employees.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for his persistence. It has been my privilege to work with him for, now, almost 20 years on this legislation, and it was my privilege to precede him as the chairman of this committee.

The most recent occasion upon which we passed this legislation was in 1989 when President Bush vetoed the legislation, and then this House voted to override the veto, and everybody fully expected that the other body would do the same. Then two people who had voted for the passage of the bill changed their vote on the veto override vote, and it was defeated by that very narrow margin with tremendous lobbying from the other end of the street.

Now, it is a little different picture, because we have a President who has made a commitment that if we get this bill back in substantially the same form to him, he will sign it. And it is about time. We are talking about legislation that was politically motivated in the worst sense of politics when it was passed in 1939. There were a number of Senators who promoted this from the President's own party who thought that they could use this as a weapon to defeat that President for reelection in 1940. There were 11 Senators against whom the President had indicated his support, and it was thought that the WPA workers and the PWA workers and the others were following the President's recommendations, and their revenge was something called the Hatch Act.

□ 1550

Now, think of 1939, before World War II. There were no civil rights laws, we did not have debates in the Congress about the rights of women to be protected in the workplace, we did not have most of the individual protection laws that have emerged, primarily as a byproduct of the civil rights movement of the 1960's, none of them. We did not have an integrated military in 1939. That came along 11 years later, 11 years after the Hatch Act, before black people could serve on an equal footing in our Army.

So, the time was different. The circumstances were different.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest this to people who are opposing this legislation and saying, "Not now": Do you believe that in the America of 1939 you could pass an act that disenfranchised 3 million people for any reason at all from the right to vote, after we passed the voting rights legislation, even motor-voter legislation very recently, and we passed civil rights legislation for groups in our society, like minorities and women, who were discriminated against openly and by law in 1939, when this act was written?

This country has changed. One of the blocks that remains from that bad, sad time of pre-World War II America is the Hatch Act, and we have a chance, by supporting Chairman CLAY and his committee, to put this behind us and get on with the future of America.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 20, long overdue legislation that would return to Federal and postal employees the right to participate in the Nation's political process.

This is, of course, our second vote on the bill in a week. As last week's vote showed, there is overwhelming support for Hatch Act reform, as there was for the virtually identical bill passed by the 101st Congress nearly 4 years ago. That bill was vetoed by President Bush, and the veto of the bill that emerged from Congress was overridden by the House but narrowly sustained by the Senate. We look forward to sending its successor to President Clinton for his signature.

This bill was reported from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on a voice vote, with overwhelming support. It enjoyed a similar level of support when I had the honor to chair that committee in 1989. Then, the House passed it on suspension with 297 votes in favor.

For far too long Federal employees have suffered under the yoke of the Hatch Act, which was written for a different time and under far different circumstances. No longer should those who serve their Federal Government be denied basic rights enjoyed by other Americans.

It is important to understand that H.R. 20 has been developed over succeeding Congresses, mostly under Republican Presidents and now under a Democratic President. It is the product of bipartisan compromise.

The bill would give Federal workers the right to participate fully in the political process—off the job. They would be able to manage campaigns, solicit contributions, work on phone banks, and run for office. But employees would continue to be prohibited from engaging in partisan political activity while on duty. The bill would not turn the Federal workplace into a political arena. This is a system that has worked well for many States and even for foreign governments.

The bill contains strong, clear criminal prohibitions of abuses of official influence. It would prohibit employees from intimidating, threatening, commanding, or coercing any Federal employee to engage or not engage in any political activity—voting, making political contributions, working for candidates, or refusing to engage in these activities. It would forbid employees from giving political contributions to their superiors, and forbid superiors from soliciting contributions. In the process, it would sweep away the quilt of 3,000 rulings on the Hatch Act that have been handed down over the years, replacing it with a simple distinction: activities on and off the job.

I want to emphasize that the bill would establish criminal penalties. Violators would be subject to fines of up to $5,000 or 3 years in

prison, or both. The bill also authorizes civil penalties including firing, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for up to 5 years, and fines of up to $1,000.

It is vital in a democracy to have citizen participation. And that should include all citizens, without exception for those who happen to work for Federal agencies. As our democracy does not compel political participation by any group, neither should it forbid it.

Since it was passed in 1939, our country has paid dearly for the Hatch Act. We have denied ourselves the benefit of hearing from thousands of our best informed citizens on issues that come before us.

Opponents of the bill point to the conditions that led to passage of the Hatch Act as a chief reason for continuing its prohibitions. They choose to ignore the changes in Government and the political environment since then.

As lawmakers it is our duty to ensure that Federal laws fit the times. The Hatch Act was enacted during a period of rapid expansion of the Federal Government, at the end of the Great Depression.

There was justifiable fear that Federal workers could be manipulated by those to whom they felt they owed their jobs. The Hatch Act was created to protect Federal workers from the political system and the system from Federal workers.

Mr. Chairman, this law no longer fits the times. Today, we have a firmly established merit system that protects both employees and the public from political abuses that might result from employee political activities. In 1939, less than one-third of the Federal work force was under the merit system. Now the proportion is more than three-fourths.

H.R. 20 has as its primary proposition the belief that Federal employees should be free to engage in any political activity off the job. I am proud to support that proposition and this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, 202 years ago in this body an attempt was made, through the proposal of an amendment, to limit the activities of public employees, Federal inspectors of distilled spirits. A vote was taken on the amendment, and it was defeated by a vote of 21 in favor and 37 against, primarily on the grounds, and I quote, "This amendment will muzzle the mouths of free men and take away their use of reason."

Many years later, in the 1930's, without the benefit of either debate or public hearing, the Hatch Act was placed into law. Senator Carl Hatch of New Mexico, as I say, without the benefit of any public hearings and with almost no comment in the U.S. Senate on his amendment, placed his amendment on another piece of legislation, which had nothing to do with the topic, by the way.

That amendment was not voted on in the U.S. Senate but was simply accepted, came here to the House, received no discussion, no hearings, was not voted on, but nonetheless was placed in the legislation, continued to be attached to it. And when the legislation was signed, the Hatch Act became the law of the land.

Fear played a major role in the passage of the Hatch Act. It is, I believe, a stain on America's cherished right of freedom of political expression. The Hatch Act, in my judgment, is a blot on the right of America's citizens to be politically involved.

This legislation before us is properly numbered, it is numbered as H.R. 20, and it is almost 20 years old and has been discussed and debated and considered. Members of Congress have received thousands and thousands of recommendations, pro and con, how to improve the legislation, and H.R. 20 is the result.

H.R. 20 is grounded in the concept that Federal employees should be free to engage in political activities on their own time, but should not engage in any political activities on the job.

Let us restore the rights and the responsibilities of political involvement to those Americans who work for the public.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, for those who did have a difference in procedure today, I urge you to support this legislation. It is good legislation. It is long overdue. Please support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 20, the Federal Employees' Political Activities Act of 1993. This bill is a bipartisan effort and was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and was approved by this body during the last Congress.

The Hatch Act was approved in 1939 and is badly in need of revisions. This reform legislation, I cosponsored, is needed to allow America's Federal employees the same right as every other citizen—the right to participate in the political process, without fear of losing one's job.

In my home State of Alaska, the Federal employees have spoken out loud and clear in favor of this bill. I strongly encourage my colleagues in this body to pass this legislation and restore to Federal employees basic first amendment rights to freely participate in our political system and make a positive change for our children and grandchildren.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 20, the Federal Employees' Political Activities Act. We all know that the legislation now before us has been debated for many years now.

Let's talk first about what this bill does. This measure permits Federal workers to participate in the political process while still being shielded from political influence or coercion. This bill eliminates ambiguity in current law. This bill provides much clearer definitions of permissible and impermissible activities, and establishes strict guidelines for proper conduct. And this bill builds on protections against influence and abuse provided by the current merit system by establishing strong enforcement mechanisms including civil and criminal penalties.

One thing this bill does not do is politicize the Federal work force. Granting Federal workers the right to participate in partisan politics is long overdue. No other country in the world restricts the activities of the men and women who serve their governments. Why should we?

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to take action. For far too long, we have refused hundreds of thousands of citizens the right to participate in their communities. Let us not fail those who dedicate their lives to serving this Nation again today. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 20 without amendments.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong favor of H.R. 20, the Hatch Act reform bill. The key word here, Mr. Chairman, is reform. The Hatch Act served a purpose in the less stabile political climate of the 1930's and 1940's by protecting Federal employees from being strong-armed into partisan campaign work.

Today, the need to protect workers from such coercion no longer exists. With effective measures in place to protect the rights of these workers and an alert media closely monitoring the political activity of all organizations, the Hatch Act has, thankfully, outlived its original purpose.

Today, instead of protecting Federal employees, the Hatch Act serves only to silence them, violating their rights of free speech and political association.

The bill before us today would ensure the protection of Federal employees against political coercion by clearly defining the prohibitions against the misuse of official authority.

Federal employees and postal workers are an important part of our national work force whose collective input is a necessary thread to the very fabric of democracy. To stifle that input is an injustice.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 20, which would allow approximately 3 million Americans to speak out and exercise their constitutionally guaranteed rights.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, today is a very special day for employees who work at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bangor Submarine Base, Fort Lewis, McChord Air Force Base, and in fact all other Federal facilities across the country. Because today we begin the final lap in a painfully long effort to provide Federal workers with the basic right to participate as full citizens in the political process of this great democracy. We will soon see emancipation from the unfair and unnecessary restrictions of the Hatch Act.

Since 1939, a painful irony has existed that prevents millions of citizens sworn to protect, defend, and serve their country from exercising their conscience and good citizenship. It is high time for the Congress and the President to change this anachronism. As the Commission on Political Activities of Government Personnel stated in 1968, "The present Hatch Act is confusing, ambiguous, restrictive, negative in character, and possibly unconstitutional." I commend my colleagues, Chairman Clay and fellow Appropriations member JOHN MYERS, for introducing this reform act. And unlike past efforts where the House has passed these reforms only to see them stalled short of enact-

ment, it appears that the Congress will at long last provide political equality to our Nation's Federal Employees, and the President will sign the bill.

The act contains strict protective provisions and penalties that will prevent civil servants from intimidation and political favoritism. This enforcement includes fines, official reprimands, reduction in pay grade, removal from service, and imprisonment.

Opponents of Hatch Act reform cannot claim that this matter was brought to the floor on a fast track. Similar legislation was approved by the House during the 100th and 101st Congresses, and although a bill was not reported to the floor during the 102d Congress, the question was thoroughly aired by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I encourage my colleagues to end this sanctioned second-class citizenship. Vote for H.R. 20 and free Federal employees from our current unjust law.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for reforming the Hatch Act for Federal employees. This law unfairly restricts certain U.S. citizens from exercising their rights of free speech and free assembly granted under the Constitution. The Hatch Act is contradictory, vague, and outdated.

However, the Hatch Act must remain in place for employees of the Federal Election Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, and those Federal employees who work for regulatory and enforcement agencies. Imagine having someone appear at your door asking for a political contribution and then finding out shortly thereafter that person is an IRS official auditing your tax returns. Federal employees in the regulatory and enforcement agencies are able to exert influence over private citizens which other Federal employees cannot do.

I had been a long-time opponent of reforming the Hatch Act. I had been concerned that Federal employees could not be adequately protected against coercion by their bosses and I still believe we must be vigilant about such pressures. However, after speaking to a number of constituents who are Federal employees, I believe their right not to participate will be protected. However, it is imperative and necessary that Federal employees in the regulatory and enforcement agencies be exempted from this reform.

I believe proper reform of the Hatch Act will allow Federal employees in agencies not involved in regulations or enforcement to actively engage in the political process and to exercise their rights as American citizens while maintaining the integrity and public trust of the civil service.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 20, the Federal Employees' Political Activities Act of 1993. This bill, which amends the Hatch Act of 1939, is a bill whose time has come. For too long, Federal employees have been shut out or unclear about their right to participate in the political process. H.R. 20 solves this problem by clearly defining which activities Federal employees and postal workers can participate in and which ones they can't.

Beyond establishing much needed definitions for Federal employees, H.R. 20 ensures that Federal and postal workers have the right to exercise the political rights and freedoms that the rest of us use freely. When workers are at home or finished with work for the day, they will be able to behave like other Americans and, if they choose, distribute leaflets for a candidate or cause, work at a telephone bank, or run for office, as long as their activities do not interfere with their job performance. Workers will not, however, be able to use their office, Government vehicle, or official authority to promote a political cause. To emphasize the seriousness of violating these regulations, civil and criminal penalties would be put in place to enforce the provisions of H.R. 20.

The Federal Employees' Political Activities Act of 1993 sets simple and fair guidelines for Federal employees and postal workers. Let's be fair and pass this bill quickly so that American workers can receive the long-awaited reform that they deserve.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 20 is as follows:

H.R. 20

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER III—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

"§ 7321. Political participation

"It is the policy of the Congress that employees should be encouraged to exercise fully, freely, and without fear of penalty or reprisal, and to the extent not expressly prohibited by law, their right to participate or to refrain from participating in the political processes of our Nation.

"§ 7322. Definitions

"For the purpose of this subchapter—

"(1) the term 'employee' means any individual—

"(A) employed or holding office in an Executive agency, other than the General Accounting Office; or

"(B) employed in a position within the competitive service which is not in an Executive agency;

but does not include the President or the Vice President, or a member of the uniformed services;

"(2) the term 'candidate' means any individual who seeks nomination for election, or election, to any elective office, whether or not the individual is elected, and, for the purpose of this paragraph, an individual shall be considered to seek nomination for election, or election, to an elective office, if the individual has—

"(A) taken the action required to qualify for nomination for election, or election, to that office; or

"(B) received any political contribution (other than any personal services described in paragraph (3)(C)) or made any expenditure, or has given consent for any other person to receive any political contribution (other than any such personal services) or make any expenditure, with a view to bringing about the individual's nomination for election, or election, to that office;

"(3) the term 'political contribution' means any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value, made for any political purpose, and includes—

"(A) any contract, promise, or agreement, express or implied, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution for any political purpose;

"(B) any payment by any person, other than a candidate or a political party or affiliated organization, of compensation for the personal services of another person which are rendered to any candidate or political party or affiliated organization without charge for any political purpose; and

"(C) the provision of personal services for any political purpose;

"(4) the term 'superior' means any employee who exercises supervision of, or control or administrative direction over, another employee;

"(5) the term 'elective office' means any elective public office and any elective office of any political party or affiliated organization;

"(6) the term 'person' includes any individual, corporation, trust, association, State, local, or foreign government, territory or possession of the United States, or agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing; and

"(7) the term 'Special Counsel' means the Special Counsel appointed under section 1211(b).

"§ 7323. Use of official influence or official information; prohibition

"(a) An employee may not directly or indirectly use or attempt to use the official authority or influence of the employee for the purpose of—

"(1) interfering with or affecting the result of any election; or

"(2) intimidating, threatening, coercing, commanding, influencing, or attempting to intimidate, threaten, coerce, command, or influence—

"(A) any individual for the purpose of interfering with the right of any individual to vote as the individual may choose, or of causing any individual to vote, or not to vote, for any candidate or measure in any election;

"(B) any person to give or withhold any political contribution; or

"(C) any person to engage, or not to engage, in any form of political activity.

"(b) An employee may not directly or indirectly use or attempt to use, or permit the use of, any official information obtained through or in connection with such employee's employment for any political purpose, unless the official information is available to the general public.

"(c) For the purpose of subsection (a), 'use of official authority or influence' includes—

"(1) promising to confer or conferring any benefit (such as any compensation, grant, contract, license, or ruling) or effecting or threatening to effect any reprisal (such as deprivation of any compensation, grant, contract, license, or ruling); or

"(2) taking, directing others to take, recommending, processing, or approving any personnel action.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be considered to apply with respect to any actions if, or to the extent that, such actions are

taken in order to carry out the duties and responsibilities of one's position.

"§ 7324. Solicitation; prohibition

"(a) An employee may not—

"(1) give or offer to give a political contribution to any individual either to vote or refrain from voting, or to vote for or against any candidate or measure, in any election;

"(2) solicit, accept, or receive a political contribution to vote or refrain from voting, or to vote for or against any candidate or measure, in any election;

"(3) knowingly give or hand over a political contribution to a superior of the employee; or

"(4) knowingly solicit, accept, or receive, or be in any manner concerned with soliciting, accepting, or receiving, a political contribution—

"(A) from another employee (or a member of another employee's immediate family) with respect to whom the employee is a superior; or

"(B) in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by—

"(i) an individual employed or holding office in the Government of the United States; or

"(ii) an individual receiving any salary or compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States.

"(b)(1) In addition to the prohibitions of subsection (a), an employee may not knowingly solicit, accept, or receive a political contribution from, or give a political contribution to, any person who—

"(A) has, or is seeking to obtain, contractual or other business or financial relations with the agency in which the employee is employed;

"(B) conducts operations or activities which are regulated by that agency; or

"(C) has interests which may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of the employee's official duties.

"(2) The Special Counsel shall prescribe regulations which exempt an employee from the application of paragraph (1) with respect to any political contribution to or from an individual who has a familial or personal relationship with the employee if the employee complies with such requirements as the Special Counsel shall so prescribe which relate to the disqualification of the employee from engaging in any official activity involving the individual.

"(3) The Special Counsel shall prescribe regulations under which paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any political contribution from a person in situations in which the facts and circumstances indicate there would not be any adverse effect on the integrity of the Government or the public's confidence in the integrity of the Government.

"§ 7325. Political activities on duty, etc.; prohibition

"(a) An employee may not engage in political activity—

"(1) while the employee is on duty;

"(2) in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by an individual employed or holding office in the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof;

"(3) while wearing a uniform or official insignia identifying the office or position of the employee; or

"(4) using any vehicle owned or leased by the Government of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(b)(1) An employee described in paragraph (2) may engage in political activity otherwise prohibited by subsection (a) if the costs associated with that political activity are not paid for by money derived from the Treasury of the United States.

"(2) Paragraph (1) applies to an employee—

"(A) the duties and responsibilities of whose position continue outside normal duty hours and while away from the normal duty post; and

"(B) who is—

"(i) paid from an appropriation for the Executive Office of the President; or

"(ii) appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose position is located within the United States, who determines policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws.

"§ 7326. Candidates for elective office; leave

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (c), an employee who is a candidate shall, upon the request of the employee, be granted leave without pay for the purpose of allowing the employee to engage in activities relating to that candidacy.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 6302(d), and except as provided in subsection (c), an employee who is a candidate shall, upon the request of the employee, be granted accrued annual leave for the purpose of allowing the employee to engage in activities relating to that candidacy. Leave under this subsection shall be in addition to leave without pay to which the employee may be entitled under subsection (a).

"(c) A request for leave submitted under subsection (a) or (b) may be denied if the exigencies of the public business so require. Any such denial shall be in writing and shall be accompanied by a statement of the reasons why the request is being denied.

"(d) An employee may not be required to take leave without pay under subsection (a), or accrued annual leave under subsection (b), in order to be a candidate, unless the activities relating to the candidacy interfere with the employee's performance of the duties of the position.

"§ 7327. Regulations

"The Special Counsel shall prescribe any rules and regulations necessary to carry out this subchapter.".

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 3302(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "7203, 7321, and 7322" and inserting "and 7203".

(2)(A) Sections 8332(k)(1), 8706(c), and 8906(e)(2) of title 5, United States Code, are each amended by inserting immediately after "who enters on" the following: "leave without pay granted under section 7326(a) of this title, or who enters on".

(B) Section 8411(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before "approved leave without pay" the following: "leave without pay granted under section 7326(a) of this title, or".

(3) The section analysis for subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER III—POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

"7321. Political participation.
"7322. Definitions.
"7323. Use of official influence or official information; prohibition.
"7324. Solicitation; prohibition.
"7325. Political activities on duty, etc.; prohibition.
"7326. Candidates for elective office; leave.
"7327. Regulations.".

(4) Section 1216(c) of title 5, United States Code is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1); and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "(2) If" and inserting "If".

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18.—(1) Section 602 of title 18, United States Code, relating to solicitation of political contributions, is amended—

(A) by inserting "(a)" before "It";

(B) by striking all that follows "Treasury of the United States" and inserting a semicolon and the following:

"to knowingly solicit any contribution within the meaning of section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 from any other such officer, employee, or person. Any person who violates this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any activity of an employee (as defined in section 7322(1) of title 5) or any individual employed in or under the United States Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission, unless that activity is prohibited by section 7323 or 7324 of that title.".

(2) Section 603 of title 18, United States Code, relating to making political contributions, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any activity of an employee (as defined in section 7322(1) of title 5) or any individual employed in or under the United States Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission, unless that activity is prohibited by section 7324 of that title.".

(d) AMENDMENTS TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.—Section 6 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973d) is amended by striking out "the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i), prohibiting partisan political activity" and by inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, relating to political activities".

(e) APPLICABILITY TO POSTAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section, and any regulations thereunder, shall apply with respect to officers and employees of the United States Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission, pursuant to sections 410(b) and 3604(e) of title 39, United States Code.

(2) INVESTIGATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—The Special Counsel (appointed under section 1211(b) of title 5, United States Code) may conduct investigations and seek disciplinary action with respect to any officer or employee referred to in paragraph (1) in accordance with applicable provisions of chapter 12 of such title.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the authority to prescribe regulations granted under section 7327 of title 5, United States Code (as added by section 2 of this Act), shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PENALTIES NOT AFFECTED.—Any repeal or amendment made by this Act of any provision of law shall not release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability imposed under that provision, and that provision shall be treated as remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper proceeding or action for the enforcement of that penalty, forfeiture, or liability.

(c) PENDING PROCEEDINGS NOT AFFECTED.—No provision of this Act shall affect any judicial or administrative proceeding commenced on or before the effective date of the amendments made by this Act. Orders shall be issued in such proceedings and appeals shall be taken therefrom as if this Act had not been enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments to the bill are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103–24, which may be offered only in the order printed and by the named proponent, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except as specified in House Report 103–24, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Debate on each amendment will be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UPTON:

Page 12, strike line 8, and insert the following:

"§ 7327. Continued applicability of former provisions

"(a) This subchapter shall, with respect to employees of the Federal Election Commission, be administered in accordance with the following:

"(1) The provisions of this subchapter (as amended by the Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1993) shall be deemed to have no force or effect, except for this section.

"(2) The provisions of this subchapter (as last in effect before the amendments made by the Federal Employees Political Activities Act of 1993 took effect) shall be deemed to have remained in effect, except for former section 7325.

"(b) For purposes of applying the provisions of chapter 12 which relate to the authority of the Special Counsel to conduct investigations, and to seek corrective or disciplinary action, in connection with any misconduct under this subchapter, and for purposes of any other provision of law, this subchapter shall, to the extent it is being applied with respect to employees of the Federal Election Commission, be construed in accordance with subsection (a).

"§ 7328. Regulations

Page 13, in the matter after line 3, strike the item relating to section 7327 and insert the following:

"7327. Continued applicability of former provisions.
"7328. Regulations.".

Page 13, strike lines 7 and 8, and insert the following:

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "(2) If" and inserting "If"; and

(ii) by inserting "(1)," before "(3),".

Page 13, after line 8, insert the following:

(5) Section 1501(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ", the District of Columbia," after "State".

Page 15, line 20, strike "7327" and insert "7328".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON]. I will be brief.

Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of Members who are opposed to our amendment. This amendment simply maintains current law with regard to restrictions on Federal Election Commission employees, and I think it is quite obvious that partisan politics should not have a place where FEC employee responsibilities are concerned.

Once a candidate's Federal Election Commission report filing is brought into question, he or she can usually be assumed to be guilty, even before an investigation begins, and if this amendment is not adopted, could open up a can of worms that I do not think anyone really wants to get into.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of an amendment to H.R. 20, the Political Activities Act of 1993. This amendment is designed to specifically address a concern that Members raised last week when H.R. 20 was defeated under suspension. I did vote for H.R. 20 under suspension last week, however, I did so with reservation. I believe that with this amendment, Members that might otherwise hesitate to vote for Hatch Act reform will feel confident that they are voting for a responsible and sensible piece of legislation.

Under H.R. 20, all Federal employees are treated similarly providing that any Federal employee may engage in otherwise lawful partisan political activity on their own time, and away from the job. This amendment carves out the employees of the Federal Election Commission and provides that these employees continue to be subject to the provisions of the Hatch Act as it presently exists. The amendment also includes authority for the Office of Special Counsel to enforce the law with regard to employees of the FEC. Unlike other Federal employees, employees of the FEC are uniquely involved in regulating the electoral process and the activities of the Federal candidate. For this reason, it is necessary to maintain the Hatch Act restrictions on Federal Election Commission employees.

The companion bill in the Senate contains similar language to that proposed by this amendment. In addition, H.R. 20 as ultimately passed by the 101st Congress, included language prohibiting FEC employees from engaging in partisan political activity. Furthermore, the Commissioners of the Federal Election Commission specifically asked that Federal Election Commission employees remain under the restrictions of the Hatch Act.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this common sense amendment which serves to protect Federal employees while restoring their basic rights of political expression. Hatch Act reform is necessary, this amendment makes this reform effort more responsible and appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the following letter into the RECORD at this point:

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, February 18, 1993.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAY, Chairman,
Hon. JOHN T. MYERS, Ranking,
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN CLAY AND MYERS: It is my understanding that as early as next week, the House of Representatives will vote on H.R. 20, the "Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993." The members of the Federal Election Commission (FEC) would like to reiterate to you our deep concern about the consequences for this agency of proposed legislation revising "Hatch Act" restrictions upon political activity by federal workers. We would respectfully request that an exception be drawn for employees of the Federal Election Commission in any legislation intended to liberalize or relax the rules prohibiting federal employees' participation in political campaigns outside the workplace.

Congress established the Commission as a bipartisan body to administer and enforce federal election laws free of partisan or political considerations. Permitting active political involvement by employees of the Commission, even outside the work environment, could only serve to compromise the capacity of the agency's staff to perform their job responsibilities in a non-partisan manner. The perception that Commission employees are or may be engaged in partisan political activity, even on their own time, would severely undermine public confidence in our ability to properly and fairly carry out the mandate Congress has given us.

The members of the Commission certainly have no objections to those provisions of the act meant to strengthen restrictions upon "on the job" behavior related to political activity. In fact, the FEC's own rules and regulations regarding political activity on the job go beyond those currently imposed by the Hatch Act. Furthermore, we wish to express no opinion as to the appropriateness of the proposed legislation as it may be applied to and impact upon the federal workforce generally.

The special exception for employees of the Commission will enable our agency to continue to fulfill our particularly sensitive role in the political process with uncompromised impartiality and credibility.

Sincerely,

SCOTT E. THOMAS,
Chairman.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and we will accept it on this side.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is acceptable to both sides, I am quite sure, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has already said. It makes a good bill even better.

Mr. WELDON. I thank the gentlemen for their cooperation in bringing this to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JOHNSON OF CONNECTICUT

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

Page 11, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 12, line 7, and insert the following:

"§ 7326. Candidates for elective office; leave

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), an employee may not seek nomination for election, or election, to any Federal or Statewide elective public office.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not prohibit an employee from seeking nomination for election, or election, to an elective public office if no person is seeking to be nominated for, or elected to, such office as the candidate of a party any of whose candidates for presidential elector received votes in the last preceding election at which presidential electors were selected.

"(c) The standards applicable under section 7322(2) in determining whether an individual is seeking nomination for election, or election, to an office shall apply for purposes of making any such determination under this section.

"(d)(1) This subsection shall apply with respect to a candidate for any elective office, except that, in the case of an elective public office, this subsection shall not apply unless the office is one which may be sought by the employee involved under the preceding provisions of this section.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), an employee who is a candidate shall, upon the request of the employee, and for the purpose of allowing the employee to engage in activities relating to that candidacy—

"(A) be granted leave without pay; and

"(B) notwithstanding section 6302(d), be granted accrued annual leave.

"(3) A request for leave under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) may be denied if the exigencies of the public business so require. Any such denial shall be in writing and shall be accompanied by a statement of the reasons why the request is being denied.

"(4) An employee may not be required to take leave without pay under paragraph (2)(A), or accrued annual leave under paragraph (2)(B), in order to be a candidate, unless the activities relating to the candidacy interfere with the employee's performing the duties of such employee's position.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] will be recognized for 15 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does significantly change the bill, but, I think, for good reason. This amendment will prohibit Federal employees from running for State or Federal office, but will reserve to them the right to run for local office; that is, town or county office.

We act here today not in a vacuum, and those of us who voted for Hatch Act reform last time remember that it went into the conference committee and the other body adamantly opposed granting Federal employees the right to run for political office, gave them instead the right to run for State party offices, for local party offices, but not to do the kind of public service that Federal employees want to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have never once had a Federal employee come into my office and ask me to gain for them the right to serve as the local town chairman or the State party chairman, but I have had hundreds of Federal employees come into my office and implore me to find a way for them to be able to serve on their local board of education to govern the schools that their children go to.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good amendment. It will help to improve the bill, and we will accept it on this side.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for his support.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] for offering this amendment. It is one we have discussed but we had not put in the bill. We thank the gentlewoman for it, and we accept it on this side, too.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], and I submit the rest of my statement for the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, as a strong advocate for responsible Hatch reform, I urge Members to support my amendment to give Federal employees the right to run for local political office only. This amendment will give Federal employees the most treasured political right—that to run for local school board or serve as a selectman—without compromising the apolitical nature of our Federal work force.

I thank the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, BILL CLAY, and ranking member JOHN MYERS for their leadership on Hatch reform. Unfortunately, the bill as currently written will not pass the Senate. In the 101st Congress the Senate opposed allowing Federal employees to run for office at all levels because they fear it opens the door to the kind of abuse and intimidation that led to the passage of the original Hatch Act. Yet, the Senate would allow Federal employees to run for political office like State party chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would make two points. First, I have never once had a Federal employee ask for the right to be deputy town committee chairman, or even State party chairman, but I have had Federal employees implore me to let them run for the school board, the county council, a town selectman or selectwoman. Second, the intimidation concern is no issue at all in local elections. The vast majority of Federal employees work in cities, and live in suburbs and small towns. Very few of the people they work with live in their towns so intimidating them to vote won't help. While intimidation is possible in State and Federal contests, it cannot be used to win local races.

The Johnson amendment gives Federal employees what they want most—the right to run for local office. Every group of Federal employees who has discussed this issue with me have stated that they want to be able to run for local offices, such as school board or town council. And these are people who are dedicated to public service, who understand how important government is to the operation. Responsible Hatch reform must allow these people to serve their local communities in this manner. By stripping this bill down to the core issues, I hope the other body will support us and accept the right to serve in local political office, not partisan party offices.

Once President Clinton signs a Hatch Act reform bill into law, we will not visit the issue again for many years. Knowing how the Senate stands on this issue, if we want Federal employees to be able to run for office at all, it is critical that we present the Senate with a responsible compromise bill. If we pass a bill that allows Federal employees to run for all levels of political office, the Senate will certainly gut that language. But if we pass my compromise amendment and work with the Senate, we can test Hatch reform on this limited scale and consider further reforms in the future on the basis of experience.

The original Hatch Act's aim, a Federal civil service independent of Federal electoral politics, is as necessary and desirable today as it was 50 years ago. But we need not sacrifice the legitimate desire of Federal workers to pursue local civic and political interests that do not conflict or interfere with their duties.

The Johnson amendment makes sense and will promote responsible Hatch reform. I ask you to join me in supporting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. TORRES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 20) to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore to Federal civilian employees their right to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 106, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 86, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—333

Abercrombie	Brooks	Coyne
Ackerman	Browder	Cramer
Andrews (ME)	Brown (CA)	Danner
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (FL)	Darden
Andrews (TX)	Brown (OH)	de la Garza
Applegate	Burton	Deal
Bacchus (FL)	Buyer	DeFazio
Baesler	Byrne	DeLauro
Barcia	Cantwell	Dellums
Barlow	Cardin	Derrick
Barrett (WI)	Carr	Deutsch
Bartlett	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Becerra	Chapman	Dickey
Bentley	Clay	Dicks
Bereuter	Clayton	Dingell
Berman	Clement	Dixon
Bevill	Clinger	Dooley
Bilbray	Clyburn	Duncan
Bilirakis	Coleman	Durbin
Bishop	Collins (GA)	Edwards (CA)
Blackwell	Collins (IL)	Edwards (TX)
Bliley	Collins (MI)	Emerson
Boehlert	Condit	Engel
Bonior	Conyers	English (AZ)
Borski	Cooper	English (OK)
Boucher	Coppersmith	Eshoo
Brewster	Costello	Evans
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Rose
Fazio	Lewis (GA)	Roth
Fields (LA)	Lipinski	Rowland
Filner	Livingston	Roybal-Allard
Fingerhut	Lloyd	Rush
Fish	Long	Sabo
Flake	Lowey	Sanders
Ford (MI)	Machtley	Sangmeister
Frank (MA)	Maloney	Santorum
Franks (NJ)	Mann	Sarpalius
Frost	Manton	Sawyer
Furse	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Saxton
Gallo	Markey	Schaefer
Gejdenson	Martinez	Schenk
Gephardt	Matsui	Schroeder
Geren	Mazzoli	Schumer
Gibbons	McCloskey	Scott
Gilchrest	McCurdy	Serrano
Gillmor	McDermott	Sharp
Gilman	McHale	Shaw
Glickman	McHugh	Shays
Gonzalez	McInnis	Shepherd
Goodlatte	McKinney	Sisisky
Goodling	McMillan	Skaggs
Gordon	McNulty	Skeen
Goss	Meehan	Skelton
Grandy	Meek	Slattery
Green	Menendez	Slaughter
Gunderson	Meyers	Smith (IA)
Gutierrez	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Hall (OH)	Michel	Smith (OR)
Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)	Solomon
Hamburg	Miller (FL)	Spence
Hamilton	Mineta	Spratt
Hansen	Minge	Stark
Harman	Mink	Stenholm
Hastert	Moakley	Stokes
Hastings	Molinari	Strickland
Hayes	Mollohan	Studds
Hefner	Montgomery	Stupak
Hilliard	Moran	Sundquist
Hinchey	Morella	Swett
Hoagland	Murphy	Swift
Hobson	Murtha	Synar
Hochbrueckner	Myers	Tanner
Hoke	Nadler	Tauzin
Holden	Natcher	Taylor (MS)
Horn	Neal (MA)	Tejeda
Houghton	Neal (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Hoyer	Oberstar	Thomas (WY)
Hughes	Obey	Thornton
Hutto	Olver	Thurman
Hyde	Ortiz	Torkildsen
Inslee	Orton	Torres
Jacobs	Owens	Torricelli
Jefferson	Oxley	Towns
Johnson (CT)	Pallone	Traficant
Johnson (GA)	Parker	Tucker
Johnson (SD)	Pastor	Unsoeld
Johnson, E.B.	Payne (NJ)	Upton
Johnston	Payne (VA)	Velazquez
Kanjorski	Pelosi	Vento
Kaptur	Penny	Visclosky
Kasich	Peterson (FL)	Volkmer
Kennedy	Peterson (MN)	Vucanovich
Kennelly	Petri	Walsh
Kildee	Pickett	Washington
King	Pickle	Waters
Kleczka	Pomeroy	Watt
Klein	Poshard	Waxman
Klink	Price (NC)	Weldon
Klug	Pryce (OH)	Wheat
Kolbe	Quillen	Whitten
Kopetski	Quinn	Williams
Kreidler	Rahall	Wilson
LaFalce	Ramstad	Wise
Lambert	Rangel	Woolsey
Lancaster	Ravenel	Wyden
Lantos	Reed	Wynn
LaRocco	Regula	Yates
Laughlin	Reynolds	Young (FL)
Lazio	Richardson	Zeliff
Lehman	Ridge	Zimmer
Levin	Ros-Lehtinen	
Levy		

NAYS—86

Allard	Barton	Calvert
Archer	Bateman	Camp
Armey	Beilenson	Canady
Bachus (AL)	Blute	Coble
Baker (CA)	Boehner	Combest
Baker (LA)	Bonilla	Crane
Ballenger	Bunning	Crapo
Barrett (NE)	Callahan	Cunningham
DeLay	Hutchinson	Packard
Doolittle	Inglis	Paxon
Dornan	Inhofe	Pombo
Dreier	Istook	Porter
Dunn	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Ewing	Kim	Rogers
Fawell	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Foglietta	Knollenberg	Royce
Fowler	Kyl	Schiff
Franks (CT)	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Gallegly	Lewis (FL)	Shuster
Gekas	Lightfoot	Smith (MI)
Gingrich	Linder	Smith (TX)
Grams	Manzullo	Snowe
Greenwood	McCandless	Stearns
Hancock	McCollum	Stump
Hefley	McCrery	Talent
Herger	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Hoekstra	Mica	Walker
Huffington	Moorhead	Wolf
Hunter	Nussle	

NOT VOTING—11

Bryant	Henry	Roukema
Cox	McDade	Valentine
Fields (TX)	Roemer	Young (AK)
Ford (TN)	Rostenkowski	

□ 1636

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mrs. Roukema against.

Mr. BARTLETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on H.R. 20, the legislation just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 49, 50, 51, and 52.

Mr. Speaker, I was not present for these two votes because I was unavoidably, but happily, detained at the birth of my newest constituent, and son, Patrick Hunter Roemer. My wife Sally and I send our sincere thanks and gratitude to everyone who has extended their best wishes.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 20, FEDERAL EMPLOYEES POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT OF 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 20, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker we have completed our legislative business for the day. There will be no further votes today. We will be in session tomorrow. We expect to go in at 11 a.m. for expected further consideration of the Unemployment Compensation Act, which is currently being considered in the other body.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I had been led to believe that if the other body accepted the House version of the unemployment bill, that there would be no legislative business tomorrow. It would only happen in the event that they did have a change and it would have to come back here for concurrence.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is correct. That would be our hope. However, the information we have is that that may not be the case, so there is a good possibility that we will be here.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, if the other body does concur with the House version, will there be any votes tomorrow? Will there be a vote on the Journal, or will we just come in and have a pro forma session?

Mr. HOYER. We would hope there would not be a vote on the Journal or anything else tomorrow if we have completed our business; that is to say, the other body adopts the proposal. We are intent on passing the Unemployment Compensation Act this week. The gentleman from New York may have more information.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me ask one other question for those Members not on the floor now. Is it safe for them to assume that if they watch the Senate action tonight and the Senate concurs with the House version, that they can go ahead and make their travel arrangements and plans for tomorrow based upon no votes in the House?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would let me answer, and then I will yield.

I can say it is safe to assume that nobody on this side of the aisle will be asking for a vote tomorrow on any matter if the unemployment compensation bill is approved, as passed by the House, by the other body.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 3) 33

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who may have better information than I have.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I also may have some thoughts on this matter.

Let me just say to the gentleman that the Committee on Rules is about to meet in 10 minutes, at which time we expect to put out a so-called marshal rule which is going to waive the two-thirds issue for bringing up another rule tomorrow on this floor, which would deal with any changes that they might make over in the other body tonight.

What that means is that it is very likely that we are going to have at least two rules on the floor tomorrow, and some votes on some action that was taken over in the Senate. It is my understanding that some action will be taken and that it will not be just the clean bill that we sent over. Therefore, it is very likely we are going to have votes on this floor tomorrow.

□ 1640

If that is the case, then there is no commitment that I will not be asking for a Journal vote, because our noses are still out of joint over our treatment as far as these closed rules are concerned.

However, if there are going to be no rules on the floor, and the Senate bill does not come back over here, then I certainly would do all I could to see that there are no votes tomorrow on the floor. That is where things stand as I see it.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New York, and I think that gives us as fair an assessment as to what possibly can happen tomorrow as we can give at this time, not knowing specifically what the other body will do.

Mr. SOLOMON. I might say to the gentleman that we have received assurances from the Democrat leadership as well that if we do go upstairs in a few minutes and put out a two-thirds rule waiving the two-thirds in order to put a rule on the floor tomorrow, that there will be full cooperation between the majority and the minority as to what we are going to be voting on up there, and I would just tell the gentleman we appreciate that understanding, and we would hope that you live up to it.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and would certainly believe and have 100 percent expectation what representations were made by the leadership will be followed through on by the leadership. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The Chair will take 1-minute requests.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most severe problems facing our Nation is the lack of jobs facing our young people. The fact is that people without the hope of a promising job lose the inspiration and drive necessary to become productive members of society.

The chance at a college education has remained elusive for many of our young people mainly due to the high cost of higher education.

President Clinton has outlined his plan to remedy this problem and will fulfill his campaign promise for job creation with the enactment of a National Service Corps.

Our young people will finally have the opportunity to get a college education and will be able to repay the cost of that education by serving their community by teaching, providing police protection, or contributing to the growing need for infrastructure development.

This program will offer the flexibility for students to choose to serve either before or after they have achieved their educational goals.

We all know that pride in self and community come from having a vested interest in the success of those around you. This program both revitalizes the emphasis in community involvement and removes the barriers that keep our young people from pursuing higher education.

FACTS ABOUT NATIONAL SERVICE

The initial summer-of-service pilot program would involve 1,000 students.

The program would expand to 25,000 students next year and 100,000 students within 3 years.

Federal National Service organization programs already exist and are working. They are Volunteers in Service to America [VISTA] and the Peace Corps.

This is a $15 million total cost in stimulus package for this year in the National Service Program. Total cost over 4 years will be approximately $7.4 billion.

It is time to get our own house in order and this program will provide us with the tools necessary to focus the strength of our young people on the problems facing our Nation. This will not only result in a better place to live in for the short run, but it will also lay the seeds of community involvement and the sense of civic duty that have lately been missing in our Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF ANTIREDLINING LEGISLATION

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness held a hearing to examine redlining practices of insurance companies. The subcommittee heard very disturbing reports about a variety of practices insurance companies use to deny access to insurance to the residents of our urban areas.

To remedy this, I have today introduced legislation, the Anti-Redlining in Insurance Disclosure Act. This act will require insurance companies to disclose information about their insurance practices and activities in urban areas, such as the breakdown of policies sold by census tract, itemized by demographic characteristics. These disclosure requirements would apply to major lines of insurance, such as automobile, property, and small business commercial insurance. The legislation also requires reporting of agent location by census tract. The information generated by this legislation would help determine the true nature and extent of redlining. The public disclosure of this information would also serve as a powerful disincentive against discriminatory behavior.

In addition, the legislation includes important consumer protections. It mandates disclosure to insurance applicants about reasons for rejection or nonrenewal and protects against the termination of agents as a result of their location or the location of their customers. The act would be administered by the Department of Commerce.

The statistics discussed at today's hearing speak for themselves. Illinois Public Action revealed that there are 52 State Farm offices and 32 Allstate offices in a predominately white congressional district in Chicago. But in the Chicago portion of my district, there are only six State Farm offices and two Allstate offices outside the downtown area.

And ACORN testified that in Chicago, only 51.1 percent of occupied, single-family units in low-income neighborhoods, and only 57.6 percent in minority neighborhoods, were covered by any type of insurance, compared to 90.0 percent coverage in high-income and 87.7 percent coverage in white areas.

Selwyn Whitehead of the Economic Empowerment Foundation testified about her experience in trying to get liability insurance for her telecommunications consulting firm in the late 1980's. When she identified her firm as a woman-owned firm, of color, in Oakland, she was turned away or quoted premiums from $8,000 to $10,000 per year. But when she called on behalf of her fictitious white male boss, a Mr. Selwyn Whitehead, the first quote was for $1,200.

And, just last week, there were news reports of a former sales manager for Allstate in California accusing Allstate of closing inner-city offices and ordering workers to lose files from minority insurance applicants.

There are those who deny redlining exists, who say it never happened. Or that it is purely an urban availability problem, not related to racial discrimination. One problem is that there is a lack of good, solid, comprehensive data about insurance coverage in urban areas. This legislation should help remedy that problem.

As a practical matter, access to property insurance is a necessity for mortgage loans and is often essential for access to small business loans. Without access to affordable insurance, small businesses in our urban areas cannot prosper nor generate badly needed jobs. Similarly, access to affordable automobile insurance is often essential for residents of the inner cities to keep and hold jobs.

The Anti-Redlining in Insurance Disclosure Act is modest legislation. It is similar to the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act for banks.

Redlining practices must stop. Today's hearing and this legislation will be a first step in developing effective solutions to this problem.

A SPECIFIC WAY TO CUT THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 weeks the American people have listened to Mr. Clinton's economic plan. Polls show that a majority of Americans support what they know about President Clinton's economic package. The details of the polls show, however, that a very large number of the people support more spending cuts, less taxes, and more deficit reduction.

Based on the mail and telephone calls in my office, I can tell you that the overwhelming majority of my constituents favor more, and substantial, spending cuts before we consider raising taxes. My purpose here today is to accept the President's challenge to be more specific than he has been on potential spending cuts. But first, I would like to define the problem.

President Clinton keeps asking his critics to give him specific programs that should be cut. Unfortunately, it's not that simple. Waste runs rampant through practically every existing program. Many of these programs are justifiable but could be run more efficiently.

President Clinton talks a lot about change. Well, if he has the courage to change, I would ask him to make the most dramatic change of all. We need to change the entire organizational culture of our Government.

I challenge President Clinton to require that every Cabinet Secretary and department head take responsibility for cutting each agency's wasteful operations. This kind of request has been made before, but this time, we must demand real accountability. From top to bottom, every Government employee needs to be held accountable and disciplined when found guilty of waste.

We need to change the way our Government does business. The Government provides many valuable services to the American people, but I am sure you will agree that some are more valuable than others. I would also hope we would agree that some entire programs can be eliminated. I suggest, however, that for those remaining programs, within each one of them, there are many areas of waste which can be cut without harming or reducing the services delivered by those programs, in any way.

Over the past 2 months, I have witnessed several ways to cut the deficit from my perspective as a new Member of Congress. To illustrate the problem, I would like to offer a simple change.

I would like to propose at least a 25-percent cut in all Government printing expenditures. This year $1.9 billion has been budgeted for printing and reproduction. The executive branch will spend the most: over $1.1 billion, and the legislative branch is next, $732 million this year.

Let's start right here in our own House. I propose that we cut out mass mailings and newsletters and stop using the frank as a campaign tool. That would be real campaign finance reform.

I propose that we stop allowing pages and pages of impertinent, extraneous material to be inserted and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day.

We've all heard President Clinton talk about the lobbyists who roam the Halls of Congress. Well, it is no secret that one of the biggest lobbyist groups on Capitol Hill is the Federal Government. Government agencies spend literally thousands upon thousands of dollars to publish slick brochures for distribution to Members of Congress. They do this as a public relations tool designed to keep their budgets from being cut.

There are a multitude of other ways the Government could cut printing costs. Almost every day, the Tennessee Valley Authority sends my office a hand-delivered letter or a thick set of news clippings from regional papers. My office did not request this service, but every week they come anyway.

Here's yet another example. The Government sends out copies of reports and studies to the public free of cost. The Congressional Research Service es-

timates that it costs approximately 43 cents to handle each request. This does not include the cost of publishing and printing the documents. That figure is buried deep in the Federal budget.

For every single one of the cuts I propose, someone will say, "This is a valuable service, and it doesn't really cost that much." Well, that's nonsense. That's the kind of thinking that got us in this mess. We've got to start somewhere. I have singled out printing. But this is just one example.

I challenge President Clinton to rethink the way our Government works. I ask him to raise standards and increase accountability.

I challenge President Clinton to hold every Cabinet member and agency head accountable for reducing printing costs by 25 percent. Let's stop wasteful spending on printing costs, and in a thousand other areas, and cut the fat out of Government before we raise taxes on the American people.

□ 1650

INTRODUCTION OF THE EQUITY IN ATHLETICS DISCLOSURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 921, the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act. The bill requires colleges and universities to disclose sports-related gender equity information.

The bill number—H.R. 921—is also significant. Title IX of the education amendments, which prohibits sex discrimination in education, including athletics, was passed 21 years ago. So this bill can be thought of as title IX—21 years later.

Although there was some initial progress for women in sports after the passage of title IX, opportunities slowed to a snail's pace in the 1980's. Here are some of the facts: Only 20 percent of the average athletic department's operating budget is spent on women; about 25 percent of the athletic scholarships go to women; and only 15 percent of the recruiting budget is spent on women athletes.

With respect to women's hiring, things have actually gotten worse. In 1972, women coached over 90 percent of all women's teams, but by 1992, only 48 percent—less than half—of these teams were coached by women. Let me repeat that: 50 percent of all women's teams are coached by men. Conversely, 99 percent of men's teams are coached by men. And that is not all: women's teams are often given poorer facilities for training; worse hours for practice and competition; inferior travel accommodations; and little, if any, promotional support.

There is more at stake in this issue than providing women with an opportunity to have fun playing sports games. Studies have found that high school girls who play sports are 80 percent less likely to be involved in an unwanted pregnancy, 92 percent less likely to be involved in drugs, and three times more likely to graduate from high school.

The 21 years that have passed since the passage of title IX is overwhelming evidence that the colleges, through the National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA], cannot be counted on to clean up this mess. Although the NCAA has thousands of detailed rules governing everything from recruitment to scholarships, all of which can carry stiff penalties such as denying postseason play and television appearances, there is not a single rule to penalize a school that fails to comply with title IX. At the January annual convention of the NCAA, which I attended, executive director Dick Schultz said that he thought NCAA rules requiring title IX compliance would be impossible.

Colleges and universities have essentially ignored the mandates of Federal law, because athletic budgets are still under the control of male athletic directors, and apparently of acquiescing college and university administrators who equate expanded opportunities for women with decreased opportunities for men. This, of course, has not been the case. Over the past decade, for every 2 female participation slots added, 1.5 male slots were also added.

While stepped up enforcement by the new administration might help, additional legislation is necessary. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 921, the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act is patterned after the successful Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act. That bill required schools to disclose to prospective students and to the public, graduation rates and campus crime rates. Putting the public spotlight on athletic schools with records of sex discrimination in their programs will increase pressure for change.

Specifically, my bill requires all institutions of higher education receiving Federal funds to provide gender equity information. That information must include participation rates by gender, sports spending by gender, and coaching staff hiring by gender. Spending is further broken down into that for scholarships, recruiting, personnel, and operating expenses.

This should not be a difficult reporting task. Similar information was recently collected from the same schools as part of the NCAA Gender Equity Task Force study. The difference is that the information would be made available to the public and prospective students on an individual school basis, and not just in aggregated form.

At a hearing before the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness last week, Donna Lopiano, executive director of the Women's Sports Foundation, Thomas Hearn, president of Wake Forest University, and Phyliss Howlett, cochair of the NCAA Gender Equity Task Force all expressed support for increased disclosure of gender equity compliance.

I urge my colleagues to support this effort. I welcome cosponsors to this measure.

THE FOOD STAMP QUALITY CONTROL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, statistical precision and error rate determinations are not the stuff of which engaging conversations are made. However, as many of my colleagues are aware, these very things have been a source of angst, from time to time, with the Food Stamp Quality Control System. Just recently, 24 States and the District of Columbia settled a contentious dispute over $300 million of error-rate penalties due under the current system for fiscal years 1986 through 1991.

While the quality control system is designed to measure a State's performance in determining eligibility for food stamps benefits, the current system is based on unreliable measures of State performance, is the source of unnecessary conflicts between the FNS and the States, and has resulted in excessive error-rate penalties.

Mr. Speaker, these penalties are not for fraud or abuse in the program. Rather, they are errors often outside of the States' control, including mistakes by recipients in reporting income changes or because of the constantly shifting Federal regulations. Human error is inevitable in administering a program like Food Stamps. And those errors are likely to increase with growing caseloads.

Just this week, the USDA announced that the number of Americans receiving food stamps in December set monthly records for the nearly 30-year-old program. Approximately 26.6 million Americans—more than 10 percent—received food stamps some 21 months after the official end of the recession. We all know that when our work loads increase we are more likely to make mistakes. Now more than ever, as States grapple with this surge in food stamps applications, reform of the system is needed.

Congress took some steps to reform the QC system in 1988 under the assumption that these changes would reduce the number of States penalized and the amount of claims levied on each State. Given the excessive level of penalties in recent years, and FNS Agreement to settle for only 15 cents on the dollar in reinvestment, the current method of calculating errors and penalties must be brought into question.

Today, a number of my colleagues join me in introducing legislation which would set reasonable targets and establish a reliable and fair system for measuring State performance. Most of the changes in this bill simply make the Food Stamp Quality Control Program the

same as the Aid to Families With Dependent Children QC Program which was reformed in 1989.

While this bill may not make for stimulating conversation at dinner parties, it will make the responsibilities of many State employees more reasonable and the system more efficient.

DENIAL OF TAX INCENTIVES FOR RUNAWAY PLANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill to deny section 936 tax credits for income attributable to a runaway plant. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleague from Indiana, Mr. ROEMER.

This bill will end the costly and damaging practice of U.S. firms closing down operations on the mainland and relocating in Puerto Rico to take advantage of the possessions tax credit.

Under 936 of the Internal Revenue Code, a domestic company can set up a 936 corporation to operate in Puerto Rico or the possessions. Income earned by the 936 corporation qualifies for section 936 tax credit which essentially makes the income free from U.S. income tax. In addition, qualified possessions corporations are typically granted full or partial exemption from Puerto Rico income tax, under Puerto Rican law, if a company states that there will be no mainland job dislocation.

By providing a credit against tax for income earned in Puerto Rico and the possessions, the tax system has lured many major stateside corporations to Puerto Rico. These 936 companies provide direct employment for about 100,000 workers on the island.

The 936 credit is a substantial incentive. According to the most recent Treasury Department report "The Operation and Effect of the Possessions Corporation System of Taxation," the U.S. tax benefits per employee averaged $26,725 per employee for all manufacturing industries in 1987. Although the possessions corporations' U.S. tax benefits vary substantially by industry, the pharmaceutical industry hit the jackpot with $70,778 in tax benefits per employee in 1987.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated the revenue loss of section 936 to be $18.7 billion over the next 5 years.

Although there will be outright denial that even one runaway plant exists in Puerto Rico, advertisements paid for by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico indicate otherwise. In the June 1992 issue of Chief Executive, Puerto Rico touts the 100 percent U.S. Federal tax credit as a reason that more than 60 major U.S. corporations have moved to Puerto Rico.

It's time to refine our policy. Mainland workers should not be forced to subsidize Puerto Rico with their jobs as well as their tax dollars. This bill denies the possessions tax credit for any income attributable to a runaway plant.

Under the bill, a 936 company must file a request for 936 status with the Secretary of Treasury prior to commencing operations in Puerto Rico or substantially expanding its operations in Puerto Rico. The Secretary must determine that the operations at the facility will not have a substantial adverse effect on the level of employment at a mainland plant operated by the electing corporation or a related party or supplier.

To assure that the Secretary has adequate information on which to base his decision, the bill provides that notice of each request for 936 status be published in the Federal Register, opportunity for public comment must be provided, and notice of the Secretary's determination in each case shall be published in the Federal Register.

In addition, the background file relating to each determination shall be made available to the public.

The Secretary shall revoke the 936 credit at any time within 3 years of commencement (or expansion) of operations if the Secretary determines that, based on facts and circumstances that become known after the original determination, there is a substantial adverse effect on mainland employment. The effect of this revocation is to treat the runaway plant income as income of the corporation's U.S. shareholders.

The Secretary shall revoke the 936 credit of a corporation at any time there is a misrepresentation or a failure to disclose critical information by the taxpayer in its request for 936 status.

The bill is prospective. It applies to new 936 companies or expansions of current 936 companies after March 3, 1993.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON PUERTO RICO AND POSSESSION TAX CREDIT.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Puerto Rico and possession tax credit) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) DENIAL OF CREDIT FOR INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO RUNAWAY PLANTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO SHAREHOLDERS.—The runaway plant income of a corporation electing the application of this section for any taxable year (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'electing corporation') shall be included on a pro rata basis in the gross income of all shareholders of such electing corporation at the close of the taxable year of such electing corporation as income from sources within the United States for the taxable year of such shareholder in which or with which the taxable year of such electing corporation ends.

"(B) EXCLUSION FROM THE INCOME OF AN ELECTING CORPORATION.—The taxable income of an electing corporation shall be reduced by the amount which is included in the gross income of a shareholder of such corporation by reason of subparagraph (A).

"(2) FOREIGN SHAREHOLDERS; SHAREHOLDERS NOT SUBJECT TO TAX.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply with respect to any shareholder—

"(i) who is not a United States person, or

"(ii) who is not subject to tax under this title on runaway plant income which would be allocated to such shareholder (but for this subparagraph).

"(B) TREATMENT OF NONALLOCATED RUNAWAY PLANT INCOME.—For purposes of this subtitle, runaway plant income of an electing corporation which is not included in the gross income of a shareholder of such corporation by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as taxable income from sources within the United States.

"(3) EXCLUSION OF INCOME FOR QUALIFICATION TESTS.—Any gross income taken into account in determining the amount of the runaway plant income of any electing corporation shall not be taken into account for purposes of subsection (a)(2).

"(4) RUNAWAY PLANT INCOME.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'runaway plant income' means the portion of the taxable income of the electing corporation which is attributable to a disqualified facility.

"(5) DISQUALIFIED FACILITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'disqualified facility' means any facility at which operations are commenced with respect to the electing corporation after March 3, 1993 unless—

"(i) the Secretary determines that operations at such facility—

"(I) will not result in a substantial adverse effect on the level of employment at any facility in the United States operated by the electing corporation or a person related to the electing corporation, and

"(II) will not result in such an effect with respect to any other facility in the United States on account of changes in a supplier relationship to the electing corporation or a person related to the electing corporation, and

"(ii) the electing corporation files a request with the Secretary for a determination under clause (i) on or before the earlier of—

"(I) the day 90 days after the date on which an application is submitted to the possession for tax incentives for such facility, or

"(II) the day 1 year before the date on which operations at such facility commence.

The Secretary may treat a request not filed before the time required under clause (ii) as timely filed if the Secretary determines that there was reasonable cause for not filing the request before the time required.

"(B) CERTAIN REVOCATIONS REQUIRED.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall revoke a determination under subparagraph (A)(i) at any time before the close of the 3-year period beginning on the date on which operations at the facility commenced if the Secretary determines that, on the basis of the facts and circumstances then known, the requirements of subparagraph (A)(i) are not satisfied.

"(ii) MISREPRESENTATIONS, ETC.—The Secretary shall, at any time, revoke a determination under subparagraph (A)(i) if, in connection with the request for such determination, there was a misrepresentation with respect to (or a failure to disclose) any material information by the electing corporation or a related person.

"(iii) REVOCATIONS RETROACTIVE.—If any determination is revoked under this subparagraph, this subsection (other than paragraph (8) thereof) shall be applied as if such determination had never been made.

"(C) OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—No determination may be made under subparagraph (A)(i) unless the Secretary allows an opportunity for public comment on the request for such determination.

"(6) EXPANSIONS TREATED AS SEPARATE FACILITIES.—

"(A) In general.—For purposes of this subsection, any substantial increase in employment at a facility shall be treated as a separate facility at which operations are commenced with respect to the electing corporation as of the date of such increase.

"(B) SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN EMPLOYMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), there shall be deemed to be a substantial increase in employment as of any day at any facility if—

"(i) such day is the last day of a payroll period and the average number of employees performing services at such facility during such period exceeds 110 percent of the average number of employees performing services at such facility during the corresponding payroll period in the preceding calendar year, or

"(ii) there is an expansion in such facility or the operations at such facility with respect to which a separate or supplemental application or other request relating to tax incentives for such expansion is made to governmental authorities of the possession.

Appropriate adjustments in the application of clause (i) shall be made in the case of employees not performing services on a full-time basis.

"(7) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(A) DISTRIBUTIONS TO MEET QUALIFICATION STANDARDS.—Rules similar to the rules of subsection (h)(4) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

"(B) RELATED PERSON.—For purposes of this subsection, the rules of subparagraphs (D) and (E) of subsection (h)(3) shall apply in determining whether any person is related to the electing corporation.

"(8) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—

"(A) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register—

"(i) a notification of each request for a determination under paragraph (5)(A)(i), and

"(ii) a notification of the Secretary's determination in the case of each such request.

"(B) PUBLIC INSPECTION OF DETERMINATION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 6103, the text of any determination made by the Secretary under paragraph (5)(A)(i) and any background file document relating to such determination shall be open to public inspection at such place as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(ii) EXEMPTIONS FROM DISCLOSURE.—Rules similar to the rules of section 6110(c) (other than paragraph (1) thereof) shall apply for purposes of clause (i).

"(iii) BACKGROUND FILE DOCUMENT.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'background file document' has the meaning given such term by section 6110(b)(2) determined by treating the determination under paragraph (2) as a written determination."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after March 3, 1993.

(2) TIME FOR FILING REQUEST.—The time for filing a request under section 936(i)(5)(A)(ii) shall in no event expire before the date 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

□ 1700

COAST GUARD ENTANGLED BY GAY ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOLLOHAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a disturbing newspaper article came to my attention this morning regarding one of my colleagues, and I have instructed staff to call Congressman STUDDS to tell him I am taking this special order tonight because I feel very strongly about what happened.

I would like to read the newspaper article and then make a couple of comments about it.

The article was in the Washington Post, and this is what the article had to say, and I quote:

A U.S. Coast Guard prayer breakfast scheduled for Tuesday was canceled this week after Rep. Gerry E. Studds (D-Mass.), * * * and chairs the committee that oversees the Coast Guard, complained about the featured speaker, a conservative who has spoken widely against lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military.

Gary L. Bauer, a former domestic policy adviser in the Reagan White House and head of the Family Research Council, said he had been scheduled for more than six months to deliver an address on balancing work and family life but was informed a few days ago that the breakfast had been canceled.

Yesterday, Bauer sent a letter to Studds, charging him with pressuring the Coast Guard to cancel the address.

"I am utterly amazed that a member of Congress would abuse his power to suppress free speech rights," Bauer wrote. He said in a telephone interview that he believed Studds had threatened Coast Guard officials over Bauer's presence at the event.

"I can't help but believe that since, in recent weeks I have criticized the President's idea about changing military rules on how homosexuality is treated, that I have stepped on the lifestyle of the Congressman," Bauer said.

Studds could not be reached for comment, but a spokesman said the allegation that Studds threatened Coast Guard officials was ridiculous.

Now, this next paragraph is of great concern to me. Mr. Speaker. It says:

Spokesman Steve Schwadron said Studds called Adm. J. William Kime, commandant of the Coast Guard, earlier this week to raise concerns about the invitation to Bauer. It seemed odd to Mr. Studds that Mr. Bauer would be asked to address an observance like this. It didn't seem, in a common sense fashion, to be a pulpit for a right-wing ideologue to vent his political agenda.

Schwadron said the decision to cancel the session was made independently by Kime.

Rep. W.J. "Billy" Tauzin (D-La.), who heads the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Coast Guard and navigation subcommittee, said Studds's call to Kime also was meant to alert him that a Coast Guard electronic message system was being used to organize opposition to President Clinton's lifting of the military's gay ban.

It was the commandant's own decision to take the steps he took in ordering the breakfast canceled and use of the electronic message system for that purpose stopped, he said. He said Kime was not aware, before Studds's call, about the use of the message system or Bauer's political views or his scheduled talk.

Coast Guard spokesman Capt. Ernest Blanchard said the breakfast was canceled because there were some concerns from members of the command that all religious affiliations were not represented. Blanchard said he had no knowledge of any involvement in the decision by Studds.

Now, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, Congressman STUDDS, my colleague, called the Coast Guard Commandant and complained that Mr. Bauer would—Mr. Bauer, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, is a Christian spokesman who speaks around the country on family values. And the purpose of his speech to the Coast Guard was to address on "balancing work and family life," and had absolutely nothing to do with homosexuality. In fact, this had been planned for 6 months, long before the issue of homosexuals being admitted into the military had even been raised by the Clinton administration.

So, my concern is that free speech was impeded, that there was an implied threat, or the possibility of an implied threat, by virtue of this phone call by Congressman STUDDS to the Coast Guard. And I think it is very unfortunate that this occurred.

This issue of homosexuality, homosexuals being admitted into the military, is one that has not yet been decided by the Congress of the United States. In fact, the President has agreed to postpone action on this for the next 4 or 5 months. At that time we will have an up or down vote on it, I am confident, in the Congress.

But to stop somebody, who is going to be talking about family values and balancing work and family values, from speaking to the Coast Guard at a prayer breakfast simply because he differs with Congressman STUDDS on whether or not homosexuals should be allowed in the military is a gross violation, in my opinion, of constitutional rights.

The Coast Guard obviously wanted Gary Bauer to speak, they obviously wanted him to speak at the prayer breakfast. It had been organized for 6 months, and it was stopped simply because Mr. Bauer had taken issue with the Congressman's position. I think it is a mistake, I think it should not have happended. I think it is very unfortunate. I would just like to urge my colleagues to think long and hard before they start interfering with the Coast Guard's right to have anyone they want to come to a prayer breakfast simply because a Congressman may, or may not, agree with what they feel about certain issues.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–25) on the resolution (H. Res. 111) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CHILD CARE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce essential legislation, the Child Care Public-Private Partnership Act, to expand the availability of urgently needed child care services for American families.

During the 101st Congress, we worked hard to help enact major child care legislation. After a long and arduous struggle, we finally enacted compromise legislation to provide much needed assistance to parents all over the Nation.

However, it goes without saying that the legislation that was approved falls short of solving the child care crisis in this Nation. The funding for child care programs is far less than what is needed, and the Bush administration complicated matters by issuing regulations which undermine the ability of these new programs to expand and improve child care services.

Further, one crucial proposal contained in the House-passed child care bill was unfortunately omitted from the final compromise—my proposal to provide incentive grants to businesses for the purpose of expanding quality child care services.

The private sector has often been criticized for its lack of involvement in providing or subsidizing child care services. It is often pointed out that only a small fraction of the Nation's 6 million employers currently provide some kind of child care assistance to their employees.

There is a clear trend, however, toward increased involvement on the part of employers. In 1978, only 110 corporations sponsored or paid for child care services. By 1985, that figure had risen to 2,500, and by 1989, it stood at 4,100. Still, much more needs to be done.

In a 1988 survey of 1,500 employers conducted by the American Society for Personnel Administration, 50 percent of the firms indicated that they are considering or actively planning for the provision of child care services to their employees. This survey included a large number of small and midsized firms. It shows the potential is clearly there to spur dramatic expansion of services.

Moreover, a survey conducted by the families and work institute of 188 major corporations in 30 industries shows that 13 percent of major corporations now offer child care centers, 5 percent offer child care discounts, and 1 percent offer child care vouchers.

The report concludes that there is a dramatic change underway in American business, with nearly all of the Nation's largest corporations offering some types of programs to help employees meet family needs. According to Ellen Galinsky, a coauthor of the report, which is called the "Corporate Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs," although most companies still have a long way to go, innovative family-supportive programs are mushrooming, the pace is accelerating and the trend is irreversible.

There are several reasons why there is so much corporate interest in providing child care services. For one thing, employees are increasingly making clear their needs for child care assistance. However, the response of many corporations is not only a manifestation of altruism toward their employees. It is also based on an increasing realization that the provision of child care services and other family-friendly policies are directly linked to enhance productivity and increased competitiveness.

According to Dana Friedman and Ellen Galinsky of the Families and Work Institute, employer-provided child care is directly related to improvements in recruitment, retention, and improved employee morale. In a period of impending labor shortages, the ability to retain a qualified and already trained work force is of the utmost importance. The provision of child care services will help American businesses maintain and improve their productivity.

Despite the fact that child care makes sense from the standpoint of the bottom line, most businesses are still reluctant to become involved in providing or subsidizing child care. However, there is evidence that the provision of Federal incentives can be a highly successful manner of expanding private sector involvement in the child care field.

Business leaders themselves tell us that Federal incentives are likely to spur corporate involvement in child care programs. At a 1989 conference of 250 employers convened by resources for child care management in Chicago, business leaders were asked if Government assistance would spur additional corporate involvement. All of the respondents strongly indicated that Government assistance would prompt additional action on the part of business, and the majority clearly preferred a program of incentive grants.

Further, the need for business involvement in providing child care services has long been acknowledged by Members of Congress from both parties. In fact, as long ago as 1984, the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families issued a report recommending, among other things, that Congress should develop incentives for employers to expand the child care options available to their employees. This recommendation was endorsed by Democratic and Republican members of the committee.

From the standpoint of the Federal Government, public-private partnerships are a cost-effective response to the child care crisis. Because Federal grants will be matched with private contributions, a small Federal investment will leverage a much larger sum for actual child care services. At a time when Federal resources are extremely limited, the ability to leverage private sector funds must not be overlooked.

Perhaps that is why almost every major child care bill in recent years has acknowledged the need for public-private partnerships in child care. My proposal to provide Federal support for expansion of private sector involvement in child care built upon the proposals contained in many of these bills and was also developed in cooperation with experts in the field.

The proposal received virtually unanimous support from both sides of the aisle during the consideration of child care legislation by the House during the 101st Congress, and it was approved by the House as part of the omnibus child care bill. Unfortunately, it was not included in the final compromise later agreed to between Senators and the White House—even though no substantive objections were ever raised.

At the time, many leaders in the child care field from both sides of the aisle expressed their intent to cooperate in advancing this specific proposal as part of future child care legislation. Therefore, I am reintroducing my bill at this point. I am joined in doing so by Representatives SUSAN MOLINARI and GEORGE MILLER, who are also deeply committed to the goal of expanding child care services for American families.

The bill we are introducing, the Child Care Public-Private Partnership Act, is identical to the version that was agreed to by members of the House-Senate child care conference in 1990.

Specifically, it authorizes $25 million for a program of matching grants administered by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. These grants would be provided to businesses, or consortia of small businesses, to help them create or expand child care services for their employees and the surrounding community—either on-site or at a nearby location.

Grants could also be provided to nonprofit organizations to provide technical information and assistance that will enable businesses to provide child care service. However, the Secretary is directed to give priority to grant awards which are designed to increase actual child care services.

Small businesses have understandably been reluctant to become involved in providing child care services because of the capital shortages that they often face. This legislation recognizes the special needs of small business by giving a preference to grant proposals involving companies with fewer than 100 employees.

Grant recipients would be required to match every Government dollar with two private dollars. In addition, grant applicants must provide assurances that child care services will be provided at affordable rates, and on an equitable basis, to all employees, including low- and moderate-income employees. Finally, applicants must provide assurances that child care services provided with grant funds are in compliance with State and local licensing requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to join as cosponsors of this bipartisan initiative.

Public-private partnerships are clearly an important means of providing additional child care options to American families. They minimize Federal outlays, while maximizing child care options.

We know that many businesses are providing child care services, and many more are aware of the importance of child care. Clearly, it is in the interests of our Nation's families for the Federal Government to help facilitate increased employer involvement. If we can bring the private sector and the public sector together in partnership, we can significantly expand the availability of quality child care at a minimal cost to the taxpayers. This will not only brighten the future of countless children across the Nation, but it will also help us increase productivity and enhance our competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the Child Care Public-Private Partnership Act:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Care Public-Private Partnership Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF BUSINESS INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a program to make grants to—

(1) businesses and consortia—

(A) to pay start-up costs incurred to provide child care services; or

(B) to provide additional child care services; needed by the employees of such businesses; and

(2) nonprofit business organizations to provide technical information and assistance to enable businesses to provide child care services.

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE GRANTS.

To be eligible to receive a grant under section 2, a business, nonprofit business organization, or consortium shall submit to the Secretary an application in accordance with section 4.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION.

The application required by section 3 shall be submitted by a business, nonprofit business organization, or consortium at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require by rule, except that such application shall contain—

(1) an assurance that the applicant shall expend, for the purpose for which such grant is made, an amount not less than 200 percent of the amount of such grant;

(2) an assurance that such applicant will expend such grant for the use specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 2, as the case may be;

(3) an assurance that such applicant will employ strategies to ensure that child care services provided by such applicant, or provided with the technical information and assistance made available by such applicant, are provided at affordable rates, and on an equitable basis, to low- and moderate-income employees;

(4) an assurance that such applicant—

(A) in the case of a business or consortium, will comply with all State and local licensing requirements applicable to such business or consortium concerning the provision of child care services; or

(B) in the case of a nonprofit business organization, will employ procedures to ensure that technical information and assistance provided under this Act by such business organization will be provided only to businesses that provide child care services in compliance with all State and local licensing requirements applicable to child care providers in such State; and

(5) in the case of a business or consortium, an assurance that if the employees of such applicant do not require all the child care services for which such grant and the funds required by paragraph (1) are to be expended by such applicant, the excess of such child care services shall be made available to families in the community in which such applicant is located.

SEC. 5. SELECTION OF GRANTEES.

For purposes of selecting applicants to receive grants under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority to businesses that have fewer than 100 full-time employees. To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall—

(1) make grants equitably under this act to applicants located in all geographical regions of the United States; and

(2) give priority to applicants for grants under section 2(1).

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

As used in the Act:

(1) BUSINESS.—The term "business" means a person engaged in commerce whose primary activity is not providing child care services.

(2) CHILD CARE SERVICES.—The term "child care services" means care for a child that is—

(A) provided on the site at which a parent of such child is employed or at a site nearby in the community; and

(B) subsidized at least in part by the business that employs such parent.

(3) CONSORTIUM.—The term "consortium" means 2 or more businesses acting jointly. A consortium may also include a nonprofit private organization.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997.

CRAFTING A CONSTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union Address President Clinton sounded a clarion call for deficit reduction. His music was right. Unfortunately, the programmatic script which followed may prove to be more of a tragic comedy than romantic thriller. Instead of proposing that Government set an example and tighten its belt, the President called for the largest peacetime tax hike in history, a multibillion dollar increase in spending, and the postponement of any deficit reduction until the third year of his program.

What we are seeing is the development of one of the great political demarcations of the century. At issue with middle-class Americans is whether it's the spending appetite of the Government that should be disciplined or the pocketbook of the taxpayer that should be tapped. One of America's two political parties is suggesting that it intends to reduce the deficit tomorrow by raising taxes and jolting the economy with new spending programs today. The other holds that proposals for bigger Government are likely to deter job creation and that postponing deficit reduction is a prescription for lower economic growth. It believes the challenge is to address the deficit now, primarily by holding the line on spending.

In the context of a plan laid on the table, it is fair for the President to ask critics to outline a precise alternative. Here is a preliminary reaction.

Rather than raise new taxes and increase the size of Government, I am impressed with the approach of a Republican freshman, STEVE HORN of California, who has introduced legislation to reduce statutorily Federal spending 2½ percent in fiscal year 1993, 5 percent in 1994 and 1995, with Social Security, Medicare, and Head Start programmatically excepted.

Within the context of this budgeting restraint, the President would be given the authority to transfer up to 10 percent of any program's budget to another. In making such programmatic adjustments the case for an increase in education funding, particularly early childhood, and postsecondary, is in order, as are modest jobs initiatives along the lines of the old Civilian Conservation Corps, especially as they relate to summer employment—not out of a belief Federal jobs programs lead to the formation of a larger national jobs base but out of concern that pockets of America are ignored at society's peril. As long as the challenge of communism remains on the wane, the primary area where old revenue commitments can be reduced is, of course, defense spending. In addition to reducing spending on weapons systems such as SDI and the Osprey, I would suggest the case for a gigantic fiscal commitment to the space station and super collider lacks persuasiveness.

On the tax side, I would eliminate the new tax break the President proposes for real estate developers as well as the current right of merger suicidalists to deduct interest on debt assumed in large leveraged buy outs [LBO's]. American free enterprise functions best with the widest possible distribution of ownership. Conglomeration should be penalized, not subsidized by the taxpaying public. I also have doubts about tax breaks that are specific to industries, such as intangible drilling writeoffs and the oil depletion allowance. In exchange for eliminating such specific industry tax breaks and what in effect is a conglomeration subsidy, I would lower capital gains taxes, preferably to 15 percent, and index capital gains for inflation.

One change in the Tax Code proposed by President Clinton that is both populist and compelling is the call to cease allowing corporations to deduct as business expenses salaries above a million dollars. Corporations should have the right to pay their executives more than five times the President of the United States but the taxpayer should not have the obligation to subsidize such board room decisions.

Other changes a growing number of economists suggest Americans might want to keep an open mind about are the provision of greater incentives for saving and the development of new approaches to tapping revenues from the

underground economy and foreign profits derived from U.S. sales.

Putting aside the possibility of such structural changes in the Tax Code, the above macroeconomic approach would reduce the deficit over $200 billion in 3 years—$125 billion in spending cuts, $50 billion in projected program increases, and $25 billion in interest costs. In addition, I have little doubt—but here we are dealing with the conjecture of assumptions that go into econometric models—that the spur of lower interest rates with disciplined Federal spending and taxation would produce more tax paying jobs than the Clinton program and thus a larger tax base. Ironically, it is not at all clear, despite the jobs program rhetoric of the new administration, that bigger government, which is the President's approach, means a bigger number of jobs. What is clear is that a program of deficit reduction without tax increases is most likely to boost the total number of private sector jobs. Hence, the fiscal deficit is likely to be reduced with such an approach substantially more than the figures indicated through spending restraint alone and substantially more than under the Clinton program, in the outyears as well as the near term.

Four years ago I thought President Bush was right to call for a flexible freeze on Federal spending and right to attempt to negotiate with the more liberal leadership of Congress to put in place across-the-board spending caps. Unfortunately, the compromise the former President had to swallow to get spending cuts with teeth was both a tax increase—by comparison with Clinton's massive adjustment of the Tax Code a modest one-quarter of 1 percent of GNP—and sliding scale spending restraint with real fiscal discipline not required until the later years of a 6-year plan. In the first 2 years of the Bush-congressional compromise, spending increases were authorized well above the inflation rate. Afterward, restraint would only kick in if the President elected as a result of the 1992 election concurred with keeping the restraints.

The Clinton program can only be described as a magnified repeat of the Bush approach. Deficit reduction is delayed while spending and taxes are whoppingly increased. President Clinton would have been better advised to keep rather than abandon Bush's hard-won caps and deal with the deficit now rather than later. Unfortunately, his decision 2 weeks ago to release Congress from already legislated across-the-board caps has the effect of increasing spending $180 billion over the next 3 years. Given this indifference to reasoned and reasonable restraints I have come to the conclusion that spending freezes are no longer good enough. Real cuts in Federal spending are needed to adjust for the real increases that have occurred in recent years.

Real changes are also needed in the way Congress does business. The case for a line-item veto, balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and campaign finance reform are overwhelming. These three initiatives are interrelated: The first decreases both the impulse to spend and the unfairness by which Federal dollars are allocated by reducing the influence of legislative power brokers; the second puts restraints on Congress as a whole; and the third reduces the influence of special interest groups, both on spending and tax policy.

The challenge for the new administration is to shift priorities, as it is committed to do, without radically increasing either Federal spending or the deficit. The size of Government may in the long run be a more important variable than the size of the deficit. Nevertheless, while perhaps impossible to graph, I would suggest the existence of Leach's Law of Disorderly Deficits whereby at some point a seemingly incremental increase in the deficit, whether precipitated by a tax cut or new program expenditure, has a cyclonic straw-breaking effect, so punishing to market confidence, so strangling of private savings that the cost of all borrowing quantumly escalates. The first casualty of fiscal ill-discipline is the private sector borrower, the second the taxpayer, and the third any financial intermediary which lacks the capacity to hedge or adapt lending rates quickly.

Here, the role of America's banking system cannot be underestimated or President Clinton's good fortune overestimated.

Today, the biggest problem in banking relates more to the role of banks in strengthening the economy, than the role of the economy on the strength of banks.

The Bush years can be characterized as a 4-year retrenchment period in which our Nation's public financing system weakened but our private sector banking system stabilized. By the end of this year, if the legacy of S&L mistakes is finally put behind us, the United States should have the strongest banking system in the world.

President Clinton thus has the unique opportunity to build on a much stronger and more stable financial system than Mr. Bush inherited. While Bush's challenge was to increase the viability if not survivability of our banks, with runs on some banks a real possibility 4 years ago, President Clinton has the luxury of emphasizing ways the banking system can be incentivized to serve more aggressively the economy at large. At issue is not just the creation of community development banks, but, far more importantly, a regulatory climate that emphasizes bank strength—strong capital reserves—and banker discretion—the flexibility to make commercial loans on character as well as financial assessments.

Having gone from a period in which a yellow light on safety and soundness concerns has led to a red light on lending, the challenge is to give banks the green light to lend, especially for commercial activities.

If a macroeconomic environment can be established which causes an unleashing of entrepreneurial lending, all of the more ballyhooed public-sector jobs initiatives of the President will pale in significance.

The financial infrastructure is there. The only question is whether public sector leadership is up to the task of disciplining itself and thereby freeing up the private sector to create real jobs for real people.

The background of new tax policies, the bite of which on middle-class citizens will become more apparent as details are revealed in the weeks ahead, is the commitment of the administration to shift gears by this summer on health policy. There is a profound case for health care reform, but few suggest massive change is likely to eventuate without an increase in cost to the Government. With this new spending thrust on the horizon, prudence dictates that the goal of the Federal Government should be to attempt rigorously to pare back current programmatic commitments from 23 to 20 percent of GNP. If the taxpayer is going to be asked to carry the burden of new public health initiatives, care should be taken to reduce rather than increase existing Federal spending commitments. A guns and butter policy sunk LBJ. Health care added to a tax and pork policy could well do in this administration.

What seems to be lacking in Washington today is simple common sense. Also perspective. Any sense of history would suggest this is no time for America to lose self-confidence or turn with panic to the Government to solve an ever larger percentage of societal problems. There is no reason the 1990's shouldn't become the greatest boom decade in American history. In all but a few areas the United States is leading our industrial competitors. Inflation is down; GNP growth is positive; spending in the nonproductive defense arena is shrinking; world trade is growing; the banking system is secure; and, most importantly, America is at peace with the world, although more than a few societies may not be at peace with their own citizens or neighbors.

The counterbalancing negatives are the weakness of politicians and their failure to rein in budget deficits as well as the existence of stark social dichotomies, largely in inner-city areas, where drug and prejudice-based quasi-caste systems flourish. If Government can reestablish a model of fiscal prudence, opportunity fairness, and leadership ethics, the engine of American

economic ingenuity should be able to power an awesome recovery. Unhampered by leadership mistakes, the potential of America knows no bounds. Even with a few, the economy should prosper. But if a market economy is robbed of its incentive rationale, the greatest political experiment in the history of the world could be sorely tested.

IT IS TIME TO AMEND OUR BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOLLOHAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, as indispensable parts of my package of proposals for curbing illegal immigration, I introduce today, two bills dealing with the issue of automatic birthright citizenship. Both are aimed at ending the practice prevalent along the border for pregnant alien women to cross illegally into the United States for the purpose of obtaining, at taxpayers' expense, free medical care during their pregnancy, and free delivery of their babies in public hospitals, and then enabling those children to be declared American citizens at birth, with all the rights, privileges, and benefits available to citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under American law, all persons born in and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States are considered to be both nationals and citizens of the United States at birth. This principle was recognized in this country prior to the adoption of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States which embodies it.

Because times have changed, today I am introducing legislation to restrict citizenship merely by virtue of birth in the United States to persons born of mothers with citizen or legal resident status. I propose a constitutional amendment which would repeal the citizenship clause of the 14th amendment, together with a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to bring our immigration laws in line with this proposed new rule of citizenship.

This change in our laws would bring the United States closer in line with the vast majority of nations which base citizenship on the line of descent doctrine, which depends on the nationality of the parents. As a consequence, our country will be better able to pursue more sensible and humane policies to deal with the flood of illegal immigration into this country, and the serious problems this flood has caused which the framers of the 14th amendment could not have foreseen.

Mr. Speaker, for almost two centuries, American citizenship has been governed by rules based upon the place of birth rather than the line of descent. The common law principle of jus soli is codified in section 1 of the 14th amendment which provides: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." By contrast, citizenship in England, France, Germany, Japan, the former Soviet Union, the countries of the rest of Europe, and most of Asia, is established on the doctrine of jus sanguinis, or the place of the parents' citizenship. Even Canada and Australia, which follow the jus soli rule, mandate legal residence requirements.

Some constitutional scholars, including Peter Schuck and Roger Smith of Yale University, have suggested that birthright citizenship is an anomaly in a nation that is based on the will of the people and government by consent, and propose a reinterpretation of the 14th amendment's citizenship clause. They argue that its guarantee of citizenship to those born "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States should be read to embody the public law's conception of consensual membership, and therefore to refer only to children of those legally admitted to permanent residence in the American community; that is, citizens and legal resident aliens.

Whatever historic, political, and social reasons led to the inclusion of birthright citizenship in the 14th amendment, the Framers were clearly motivated by a desire to eradicate the legacy of the Dred Scott decision. In the mid-19th century, no one could have anticipated the rise of the modern welfare state or a massive increase in illegal immigration. At that time, immigration to this country was virtually unregulated and unrestricted. Labor was in short supply, and farmers, laborers, tradesmen, and mechanics were universally welcomed to an expanding nation. Americans celebrated an open-door policy as a way to make this country a place of refuge for what George Washington called the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions.

This liberal policy changed dramatically with the tide of immigration, leading over the years to various exclusion acts, national origin quotas and other legal restrictions, culminating in the more evenhanded Immigration and Nationality Act of 1986. Concerns have shifted in recent years from encouragement of immigration to control of our borders.

America takes pride in the fact that it is, and has always been, a nation in which immigrants have found asylum and opportunity and, by virtue of their hard work, and by means of their lawful efforts to obtain citizenship status, have come to enjoy the same rights, privileges, and immunities as native-born citizens. In my native California, our way of life has been enhanced and deeply enriched by the settlement of Latinos, Asians, and other persons of foreign origins within our borders. The enactment of major immigration reforms during the 1980's and 1990's attests to our continuing strong commitment to the melting-pot credo, and our belief that newcomers legally entering our shores will benefit America's economy and its social and cultural heritage.

We must recognize, however, that the United States is also a nation of finite resources and opportunities which must be available to, and shared, by all its citizens. Today, in many parts of this country, especially in California, our cities and towns are being overrun with immigrants, both legal and undocumented, who pose major economic and law enforcement problems for local governments, and place an added burden on their already strained budgets.

Despite improvements in the immigration law, and stepped-up efforts to police the border and arrest undocumented aliens, the problem of illegal aliens is a serious matter throughout southern California and the border States, as well as in many other areas of this country. After several years of decline, largely as a consequence of the ban on hiring illegals, and stiff sanctions on employers who flout the law, the number of arrests of illegal aliens is rising to the pre-1986 level of 1.8 million a year. There may be as many as 3 million aliens currently residing in southern California alone.

I need not recite the economic, social, and political problems that this crisis of illegal immigration poses to Federal, State, and local governments, to communities and neighborhoods, and to families, small businesses, law enforcement, medical facilities, health providers, schools, social welfare agencies, transportation systems, and to other legal immigrants seeking jobs and assistance. Suffice it to say, U.S. taxpayers are shelling out billions of dollars annually in various direct benefits for illegal aliens nationwide—the Center for Immigration Studies estimated the cost in 1990 to be at least $5.4 billion—benefits which are then unavailable to poor and needy families of American citizens and legal aliens.

In Los Angeles County alone, officials estimate the net cost of providing health, education, and welfare benefits to illegal aliens and their children rose by almost $70 million during the past 2 years to $276.2 million—a whopping 34-percent increase. County officials warn that the cost of the Aid to Families With Dependent Children [AFDC] Program could reach $1 billion by the end of the decade. This is not surprising in light of the fact that nearly two-thirds of all children born in county-operated hospitals during fiscal year 1990–91, were the offspring of illegal immigrant parents.

Clearly, the present guarantee under our laws of automatic birthright citizenship to the children of illegal aliens is one more causal factor contributing to the crisis of illegal immigration. When this enticement is combined with the attraction of expanded entitlements conferred upon citizen children and their families by the welfare state, the total effect of birthright citizenship laws is significant and clearly harmful. It is time for Congress to act to remove such powerful incentives.

The question of the citizenship status of native-born children of illegal aliens was never really considered by the Framers of the 14th amendment; today's situation simply did not exist at that time. Nor has this question been presented squarely to the Supreme Court for final determination. In the single case in which the Supreme Court examined the issue of alien citizenship, *United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark,* 169 U.S. 649 (1898), the majority concluded that the citizenship clause did extend birthright citizenship to an American-born son of Chinese subjects, but significantly, the parents were also permanent residents of California.

It is difficult to defend a practice that automatically extends birthright citizenship to the native-born offspring of illegal aliens. The parents of such children are, by definition, individuals whose presence within the jurisdiction of the United States is prohibited by law. If our society has refused explicitly to consent to their membership, it certainly cannot be said

to have consented to that of their offspring merely because they happen to be born in this country at the same time that their parents are here in violation of the law. Regardless of the humanitarian appeal and the innocent status of these children of illegal aliens, the legitimate needs and demands of this country's citizens and legal resident aliens must take precedence.

There are a myriad of problems created by current law. For instance, illegal aliens with citizen children are less likely to be deported than if their offspring are regarded as aliens. Illegal alien parents are subject to deportation despite the legal status of their children. In fact, however, many parents succeed in having their children here while being forced to return to their native land or, in the alternative, departing as a family and depriving the children of their American birthright, poses an extreme hardship. In addition, illegal alien parents are often able to bootstrap their offspring's citizen status into legal residence, and later, naturalized status for themselves. Once the child reaches majority he or she may file a petition for legal permanent resident status for the parents. Moreover, the parents can usually obtain welfare and other public benefits for their citizen children, if not directly for themselves. The county welfare agencies send the check to the parent for the child's benefit, but have no assurance, and with limited personnel cannot ensure, that the funds are spent for the child's needs. In any case, the parents' responsibility of providing for their children is often transferred to the Government and the taxpayers—at the expense of the needs of the children of citizen and legal resident parents.

The changes which I am proposing would resolve this issue. The joint resolution I am introducing would rewrite the citizenship clause to ensure that the citizenship of a person born in the United States is restricted to, and dependent upon, the citizenship or legal resident status of his or her mother. The companion bill would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the same rule of citizenship. These changes are to apply prospectively, that is, to persons born after the date of ratification, in order to avoid confusion, uncertainty, and litigation.

In my opinion, this legislation will bring an element of reality and fairness to America's modern immigration policies, bringing them in line with the policies of most other nations. It will satisfy the concerns of the Framers and modern critics of immigration law that American citizenship for all individuals born in the United States will be available to only those born to at least one parent—the mother—who is a citizen or a legal resident of this country. Thus, it should relieve the growing angry dissent among our citizens who disapprove of the growing numbers of newly arrived foreigners in their midst and resent the granting of benefits and services supported by their taxes to those immigrants who they suspect came to this country merely in order to have children and steal their jobs. By restoring equity and fairness, this legislation could promote broader public acceptance of our generous immigration laws and to those who benefit from them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to act promptly and pass this legislation.

H.J. RES. —

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission for ratification:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. All persons born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, of mothers who are citizens or legal residents of the United States and all persons naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. The first sentence of section 1 of the fourteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SECTION 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SECTION 3. This article shall apply to persons born after the date of its ratification.".

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIMITING CITIZENSHIP AT BIRTH, MERELY BY VIRTUE OF BIRTH IN THE UNITED STATES, TO PERSONS WITH LEGAL RESIDENT MOTHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401(a)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", of a mother who is a citizen or legal resident of the United States".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to persons born after the date of ratification of an article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States that repeals the first sentence of section 1 of the fourteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE GLENN POSHARD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable GLENN POSHARD, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 26, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS FOLEY,
The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to rule L (50) of the rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois for materials related to a civil lawsuit involving a constituent.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

GLENN POSHARD,
Member of Congress.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on Government Operations for the 103d Congress. The committee's rules were adopted on February 18, 1993, in open session, a quorum being present.

I. RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 103D CONGRESS

Rule XI, 1(a)(1) of the House of Representatives provides:

The Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in committees and subcommittees.

Rule XI, 2(a) of the House of Representatives provides, in part:

"Each standing committee of the House shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. * * *"

In accordance with the foregoing, the Committee on Government Operations, on February 18, 1993, adopted the rules of the committee. The rules read as follows:

Rule 1.—Application of Rules

Except where the terms "full committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Government Operations and its subcommittees as well as to the respective chairmen.

[See House Rule XI, 1.]

Rule 2.—Meetings

The regular meetings of the full committee shall be held on the second Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., except when Congress has adjourned. The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof, and to call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the committee may be requested by members of the committee in accordance with the provisions of House Rule XI, 2(c)(2). Subcommittees shall meet at the call of the subcommittee chairmen. Every member of the committee or the appropriate subcommittee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least three calendar days prior to each meeting or hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The minority staff shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request.

[See House Rule XI, 2(b).]

Rule 3.—Quorums

A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one-third of the members shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than the reporting of a measure or rec-

ommendation. Proxies shall not be used to establish a quorum. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

[See House Rule XI, 2(h).]

Rule 4.—Committee Reports

Bills and resolutions approved by the committee shall be reported by the chairman in accordance with House Rule XI, 2(l).

Every investigative report shall be approved by a majority vote of the committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present. Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed in accordance with House Rule XI, 2(l)(5). The time allowed for filing such views shall be three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) unless the committee agrees to a different time, but agreement on a shorter time shall require the concurrence of each member seeking to file such views. A proposed report shall not be considered in subcommittee or full committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of such subcommittee or full committee for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to the consideration of such proposed report in subcommittee or full committee. If hearings have been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the subcommittee or full committee prior to the consideration of the proposed report in such subcommittee or full committee.

Rule 5.—Proxy Votes

A member may vote by proxy on any measure or matter before the committee and on any amendment or motion pertaining thereto. A proxy shall be in writing and be signed by the member granting the proxy; it shall show the date and time of day it was signed and the date for which it is given and the member to whom the proxy is given. Each proxy authorization shall state that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present; shall be limited to the date and the specific measure or matter to which it applies; and, unless it states otherwise, shall apply to any amendments or motions pertaining to the measure or matter.

[See House Rule XI, 2(f).]

Rule 6.—Roll Calls

A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of any member.

[See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

Rule 7.—Record of Committee Actions

The committee staff shall maintain in the committee offices a complete record of committee actions including a record of the rollcall votes taken at committee business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement.

[See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

Rule 8.—Subcommittees; Referrals

There shall be six subcommittees with appropriate party ratios which shall have fixed jurisdictions. Bills, resolutions, and other matters shall be referred by the chairman to subcommittees within two weeks for consideration or investigation in accordance with their fixed jurisdictions. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdiction, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the chairman when, in his judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement therein. In a subcommittee having an even number of members, if there is a tie vote with all members voting on any measure, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for full committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation. This provision shall not preclude further action on the measure by the subcommittee.

[See House Rule XI, 1(a)(2).]

Rule 9.—Ex Officio Members

The chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees. They are authorized to vote on subcommittee matters; but, unless they are regular members of the subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

Rule 10.—Staff

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule XI, 5 and 6, the chairman of the full committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the full committee and of subcommittees subject to appropriate approval.

Rule 11.—Staff Direction

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule XI, 5 and 6, the staff of the committee shall be subject to the direction of the chairman of the full committee and shall perform such duties as he may assign.

Rule 12.—Hearing Dates and Witnesses

The chairman of the full committee will announce the date, place, and subject matter of all hearings at least one week prior to the commencement of any hearings, unless he determines that there is good cause to begin such hearings at an earlier date. In order that the chairman of the full committee may coordinate the committee facilities and hearing plans, each subcommittee chairman shall notify him of any hearing plans at least two weeks in advance of the date of commencement of hearings, including the date, place, subject matter, and the names of witnesses, willing and unwilling, who would be called to testify, including, to the extent he is advised thereof, witnesses whom the minority members may request. The minority members shall supply the names of witnesses they intend to call to the chairman of the full committee or subcommittee at the earliest possible date. Witnesses appearing before the committee shall, so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours in advance of their appearance.

[See House Rules XI, 2 (g)(3), (g)(4), (j), and (k).]

Rule 13.—Open Meetings

Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

[See House Rules XI, 2 (g) and (k).]

Rule 14.—Five-Minute Rule

A committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the chairman for that purpose. In accordance with House Rule XI, 2(j)(2), each committee member may request up to five minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. Until all such requests have been satisfied, the chairman shall, so far as practicable, recognize alternately on the basis of seniority those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others on the basis of their arrival at the hearing. Thereafter, additional time may be extended at the direction of the chairman.

Rule 15.—Investigative Hearings; Procedure

Investigative hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the committee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the committee for consideration, and the chairman shall rule on the relevance of any questions put to the witness.

Rule 16.—Stenographic Record

A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the chairman may prescribe.

Rule 17.—TV, Radio, and Photographs

When approved by a majority vote, an open meeting or hearing of the committee or a subcommittee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, 3. In order to enforce the provisions of said rule or to maintain an acceptable standard of dignity, propriety, and decorum, the chairman may order such alteration, curtailment, or discontinuance of coverage as he determines necessary.

Rule 18.—Additional Duties of Chairman

The chairman of the full committee shall:

(*a*) Make available to other committees the findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the committee or its subcommittees as required by House Rule X, 4(c)(2);

(*b*) Direct such review and studies on the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the committee's jurisdiction as required by House Rule X, 2(c);

(*c*) Submit to the Committee on the Budget views and estimates required by House Rule X, 4(g), and to file reports with the House as required by the Congressional Budget Act;

(*d*) Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the committee; and

(*e*) Prepare, after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and the minority, a budget for the committee which shall include an adequate budget for the subcommittees to discharge their responsibilities.

Rule 19.—Committee Prints

Any committee print or investigative staff report prepared for public distribution shall either be approved by the committee pursuant to Rule 4 or such print or report shall contain on its cover the following disclaimer:

"Prepared for the use of members of the Committee on Government Operations by members of its staff. This document has not been officially approved by the committee and may not reflect the views of its members."

Any such print or report not officially approved by the committee shall not include the names of its members, other than the name of the committee chairman under whose authority the document is released. Any such print or report shall be made available to the committee chairman and ranking

minority member not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to its public release.

This rule shall not apply to the publication of public hearings, legislative documents, documents which are administrative in nature or reports to or by the committee which are required under public law. The appropriate characterization of a document subject to this rule shall be determined after consultation with the minority.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BACHUS of Alabama) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GALLEGLY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 60 minutes, on March 4.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MFUME) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SABO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LOWEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, on March 4.

Mr. CLEMENT, for 60 minutes, on March 15.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 60 minutes, on March 24.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MOAKLEY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 60 minutes each day, on April 14, 20, and 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BACHUS of Alabama) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. THOMAS of California.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mr. GALLO in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. LEACH.

Ms. MOLINARI in two instances.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. EMERSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MFUME) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. TOWNS in three instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. REED.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. ROEMER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 4, 1993, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

830. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the funding authorized for the Strategic Sealift Program for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to Public Law 102-484, sections 1023(a) and 1024(d); to the Committee on armed Services.

831. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to the Netherlands (Transmittal No. DTC-18-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

832. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Israel (Transmittal No. DTC-16-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

833. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the third progress report regarding contracting for the rebuilding of Kuwait, pursuant to Public Law 102-25, section 606(f) (105 Stat. 111); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

834. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the President's determination that he has exercised the authority granted him under Section 451(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizing funds in order to support the deployment of an observer mission to Haiti, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2261(a)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

835. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

836. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

837. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

838. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period October 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 103-53); referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

839. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Federal Bureau of Prisons' annual report on functional literacy requirement for all individuals in Federal correctional institutions, pursuant to Public Law 101-647, section 2904 (104 Stat. 4914); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONIOR: Committee on rules, House Resolution 111. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 103-25). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KOPETSKI:

H.R. 1185. A bill to limit contributions by nonparty, multicandidate political committees in House of Representatives elections, to provide an income tax credit for contributions to nonincumbent candidates in such elections, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BENTLEY (for herself, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 1186. A bill to establish the National Environmental Technologies Agency; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARR:

H.R. 1187. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1975 pertaining to fuel economy standards for automobiles and light trucks; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 1188. A bill to provide for disclosures for insurance in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (for herself, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCMILLAN, and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 1189. A bill to entitle certain armored car crew members to lawfully carry a weapon in any State while protecting the security of valuable goods in interstate commerce in the service of an armored car company; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1190. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the income taxation of corporations, to impose a 10-percent tax on the earned income—and only the

earned income—of individuals, to repeal the estate and gift taxes, to provide amnesty for all tax liability for prior taxable years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1191. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to limit citizenship at birth, merely by virtue of birth in the United States, to persons with citizen or legal resident mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1192. A bill to provide for uniformity of quality and a substantial reduction in the overall costs of health care in the United States through the development of diagnostic and treatment protocols and the implementation of the protocols in the program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the imposition of limitations on the amount of damages that may be paid in a health care liability action, and the mandatory establishment by States of alternative dispute resolution systems to resolve health care liability claims, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 1193. A bill to establish a program of voluntary national service for young people and senior citizens; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, Veterans' Affairs, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOPETSKI:

H.R. 1194. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of self-management training services under part B of the Medicare Program for individuals with diabetes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LONG (for herself, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOKE, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALSH and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 1195. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 regarding quality control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MEEK, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 1196. A bill to establish a program to provide child care through public-private partnerships; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 1197. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the inclusion of certain information in files and credit reports relating to consumers; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1198. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide for the review of the extent to which foreign countries are in compliance with bilateral trade agreements with the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 1199. A bill to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and Eagle and Pitkin Counties in Colorado, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. MINK, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. YATES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. STOKES, Ms. FURSE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 1200. A bill to provide for health care for every American and to control the cost of the health care system; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, Post Office and Civil Service, and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 1201. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide an opportunity for those service members on active duty who enlisted between January 1, 1977, and June 30, 1985, to enroll in the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 1202. A bill to provide financial assistance to eligible local educational agencies to improve urban education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 1203. a bill entitled "Boot Camp Assistance"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1204. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Government Relations Act to permit the District of Columbia to impose a tax on income earned by individuals who reside outside of the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1205. A bill to provide for the retrocession of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 1206. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to make the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund available for support of certain community-based social service agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 1207. A bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to require notice of certain plant closings to be provided to the Secretary of the Treasury and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the benefits of the Puerto Rico and possession tax credit in the case of runaway plants; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and labor.

By Mr. SANGMEISTER:

H.R. 1208. A bill to establish the Civilian Technology Corporation to provide financial support for precommercial research and development in technologies that are significant to the technology base of the United States; to the committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SHEPHERD (for herself, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KREIDLER, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BONILLA, Ms. HARMAN and Mr. COPPERSMITH):

H.R. 1209. A bill to limit purchases of district office equipment and furnishings by a departing Member to items not needed for official use by the successor to the departing Member; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. ROEMER):

H.R. 1210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the benefits of the Puerto Rico and possession tax credit in the case of runaway plants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1211. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to complete construction of the Hubbard Expressway in the vicinity of Youngstown, OH; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 1212. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 80-percent limitation on the amount of business meal and entertainment expenses which are deductible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include veterans participating in Operation Desert Storm and other veterans as eligible for veterans' mortgage bond financing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restrict the requirement of citizenship at birth by virtue of birth in the United States to persons with citizen or legal resident mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ORTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to designate the week of March 21, 1993, through March 27, 1993, as "International Student Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANGMEISTER (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BILI-

RAKIS, Ms. DANNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WOLF):

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution designating December 7 of each year as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SABO, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution to recognize the heroic sacrifice of the special agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in Waco, TX; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution to direct the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate to report legislation by July 30, 1993, to expand the rescission authority of the President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 110. Resolution designating majority membership on the Committee on the Budget; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FOGLIETTA:

H. Res. 112. Resolution concerning the December 1992 Presidential election in the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself and Mr. MCINNIS):

H. Res. 113. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow Members to utilize the services of volunteers in their offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHAEFER:

H. Res. 114. Resolution requiring that the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 1994 establish outlay caps over a 5-year period; jointly, to the Committees on Rules and Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

48. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to an Endangered Species Citizen Advisory Board; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

49. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to the U.S. Government responsibility of its share of the property tax burden on Government land; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 18: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 21: Mr. WILSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 28: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. KLEIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 39: Mr. FILNER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. MEEK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 59: Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. PAXON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. KING, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 81: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 94: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KYL, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 101: Mr. GRAMS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KYL, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 123: Mr. CLINGER and Mr. SCOTT.

H.R. 159: Mr. EVERETT and Mr. INGLIS.

H.R. 163: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 229: Mr. SWETT and Ms. THURMAN.

H.R. 302: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 304: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 325: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LEWIS, of Georgia, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 326: Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 349: Mr. MINGE, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 389: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 390: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 396: Mr. KING.

H.R. 410: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 411: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 412: Mr. KYL, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 436: Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 485: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. MCCURDY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 518: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 535: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 565: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 570: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 585: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 624: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SABO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MINGE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 632: Ms. MEEK.

H.R. 633: Mr. MCCANDLESS and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 634: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 671: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. YATES, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 673: Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 710: Mr. EVANS, Mr. KREIDLER, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. COLEMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SHEPHERD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 747: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SCHAEFER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 760: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 777: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 789: Mr. FROST, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. PETE GEREN, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 821: Mr. TEJEDA.

H.R. 846: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FISH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. MCMILLAN.

H.R. 882: Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 887: Mr. PETE GEREN.

H.R. 893: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 902: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. SCOTT.

H.R. 911: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 962: Mr. MORAN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PENNY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 963: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 974: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 986: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 999: Mr. LEACH and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 1006: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1009: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. SHEPHERD, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1078: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1079: Mr. BAKER of California and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1080: Mr. BAKER of California and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1081: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1082: Mr. BAKER of California and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1083: Mr. BAKER of California and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1105: Mr. WALKER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COX, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 1114: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1135: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1149: Mr. LEVY.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. KING, Mr. KASICH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SARPALIUS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FROST, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. SCOTT.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CARR, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HEFNER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.J. Res. 90: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. MEEK.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLINGER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. KING, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. SISISKY.

H. Res. 16: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Res. 26: Mr. QUINN, Mr. KIM, Mr. CANADY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HOKE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H. Res. 38: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 40: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 43: Mr. BONILLA.

H. Res. 50: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. ROGERS.